DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 578 TM 016 203

AUTHOR	Redfield, Doris L.
TITLE	Evaluating the Broad Educational Impact of an Arts Education Program: The Case of the Music Center of Los Angeles County's Artists-in-Residence Program.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Music Center of Los Angeles County, CA.
PUB DATE	Oct 90
CONTRACT	M891211
NOTE	375p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC15 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Art Education; Artists; Art Teachers; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Intermediate Grades; Outcomes of Education; Parent Attitudes; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *School Surveys; Secondary Education; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Artists in Residence Program; *Music Center of Los Angeles County CA

ABSTRACT

A 1-year study was conducted to: document the effects of the Artists-in-Residence Program of the Music Center of Los Angeles County, Education Division (MCED); inform program planning and revision; and provide a compendium of evaluation strategies for future use. This study was divided into four phases and used a variety of methods: (1) questionnaires administered to 503 students, 54 teachers, 21 parents, 12 artists, 9 administrators, and 9 school-residency coordinators; (2) systematic observations in classrooms (12 hours); (3) focus group interviews with staff and artists; and (4) analyses of report card grades for 20 classes and attendance data for the 503 students. Overall, the results are positive. Students learned, maintained, and generalized knowledge and skills presented by the artists and demonstrated gains in subject matter grades, written and oral communication, and problem-solving behaviors. Program goals and operation were considered good, and the artists were found to be competent professionals. Strategies (questionnaires) for future evaluations, a 27-item annotated bibliography, the 1989-90 schedule of the MCED's residencies, and responses to the questionnaires and the evaluation meeting questions are provided in appendices. Twenty tables summarize study data. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CSE UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation

ED329578

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. C. BEER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATING THE BROAD EDUCATIONAL IMPACT OF AN ARTS EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Case of the Music Center of Los Angeles County's Artists-in-Residence Program

Doris L. Redfield

Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education

TM016203

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATING THE BROAD EDUCATIONAL IMPACT OF AN ARTS EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Case of the Music Center of Los Angeles County's Artists-in-Residence Program

Doris L. Redfield

Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education

October, 1990

The research reported herein was conducted with support from The Music Center of Los Angeles County, pursuant to Grant No. M891211. However, the opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of this agency and no official endorsement by this agency should be inferred.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purposes of this study, supported by Mervyn's and California Community Foundation, were to 1) document the effects of The Music Center of Los Angeles County, Education Division's (MCED's) Artists-in-Residence Program, 2) inform program planning and revision, and 3) provide a compendium of evaluation strategies for future use. The study was divided into four phases over one year and used a wide range of methods. Methods included student, teacher, artist, and administrator questionnaires; systematic classroom observations; interviews; and analyses of report card grades and attendance data.

The primary questions guiding the study's first purpose focused on the effects of the Artists-in-Residence Program on children. These questions asked whether children learned the materials and skills presented by the artists, gained in communication and higher order thinking skills, and developed positive attitudes and behaviors.

Overall, results were positive. Students learned, maintained, and generalized the knowledge and skills presented by the artists and demonstrated gains in subject matter grades. Students improved in both written and oral communication and gained in problem solving behaviors, such as the ability to hypothesize what might happen next in a given situation. Attitudes such as motivation to participate in workshop activities, self-confidence, and enjoyment of workshop activities were evident and work habit/cooperation report grades showed overall, positive gains. Findings in the social development area, while generally positive, were less clear than those in other areas. For example, work habit/cooperation grades, showed improvement in all areas except works/plays well with others.

The second purpose of the study was to assess program operation, specifically, the school-artist partnership and the relative strengths and weaknesses of the program. Overall, the MCED's program goals and content reflect high quality practice and the participating artists appear to be competent professionals who represent a wealth and variety of experiences. Additionally, the artists were observed to be sensitive to the needs of students, educators, and to the constraints of the schooling process. Compared to program components directly targeted at students (e.g., workshop content and delivery), the school-artist partnership aspect appears relatively weak. For example, given the constraints of various schooling contexts (e.g., scheduling needs and time limitations), the data indicate that most planning for the residencies is done by the artists with limited input from teachers.

A third purpose of the study was to offer a compendium of evaluation strategies for future applications and/or development by the MCED or similar programs. Strategies used throughout the study are provided in an appendix to the body of this report.

In light of the study's results, major recommendations are summarized as follows:

- While current MCED program goals and content may be modified to reflect changing needs and practice, their core is solid and should be maintained.
- The MCED may want to consider additional ways to continue and expand their capacity to support program quality among diverse residency contexts and sites. One alternative would be to develop procedural guidelines and criteria within which individual residencies could operate. For example, if residencies were "tailored" to meet the needs of particular sites, then it seems reasonable to expect that each residency have a set of goals that are 1) articulated with the MCED's goals and 2) collaboratively developed among the artist, teachers, and school principal prior to the development of the residency syllabus or workshop plans. While several sites already engage in such practices, mechanisms for increasing the consistency of quality across sites is desirable.
- Mechanisms for increasing the extent and efficiency of the MCED staff's ability to share their expertise and expectations with school personnel warrants on-going consideration. For example, one strategy may be for MCED staff to hold initial orientation/planning sessions with residency participants from multiple projects at once, perhaps in a workshop format. Another strategy might be to train experienced school-residency coordinators, over time, to conduct site-based planning and evaluation meetings. MCED staff might follow-up by interviewing the coordinators, perhaps via the focus group technique described in the body of this report.

Since this evaluation study was conducted in regular school sites where true experimental designs were not feasible, results must be interpreted cautiously. In our opinion, the results of the study indicate that the MCED's Artists-in-Residence Program exceeds expectations for meeting its goals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Music Center of Los Angeles County, Education Division wishes to thank Mervyn's and California Community Foundation whose generous support made this evaluation study possible. Thanks also go to graduate assistants and support staff from UCLA's Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) who contributed to the realization of the study: Mary Alden, Grant Alkin, Miki Baumgarten, Rebecca Frazier, Diane Krasner, Tom Marks, Lisa Siegel, and Kangxiong Yan. Special thanks additionally go to Dr. Eva Baker, CSE's Director and to Dr. Joan Herman, CSE's Associate Director, both of whom provided valuable expertise and guidance throughout the course of the study. Finally, thanks go to members of the MCED staff who impartially facilitated various data collection efforts and to the artists, educators, parents, and students who participated in the study.

CONTENTS

Page

Executive Summary iii

Acknowledgements v

List of Tables vii

Technical Report

- I. Introduction 1
- II. Methods 7
  - Overall Design of the Study 9
  - Phase I: Program Clarification and Needs Assessment 11
  - Phase II: Design and Development Activities 19
  - Phase III: Data Collection Procedures 30
  - Phase IV: Data Analyses 31
- III. Results 32
- IV. Conclusions and Recommendations 68
- Tables 80
- References 171

Appendices

- A: Compendium of Evaluation Strategies
- B: Annotated Bibliography
- C: Schedule of Residencies
- D: Transcripts of Responses to Open-Ended Questionnaire Item ("Comments")
- E. MCED Evaluation Meeting Questions

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
II-1	Data Sources by Domain	80
II-2	Data Collection by Residency Type	84
II-3	Data Collection Procedures by Phase III Research Question	88
II-4	Data Sources and Analysis Procedures	90
III-1	Student Questionnaire Results for the Total Sample	91
III-2	Student Questionnaire Results by Schools	97
III-3	Student Questionnaire Results by Grade Level	101
III-4	Student Questionnaire Results by Residency Type	105
III-5	Teacher Questionnaire Results	109
III-6	Artist Questionnaire Results	118
III-7	Parent Questionnaire Results	127
III-8	Administrator Questionnaire Results	131
III-9	School-MCED Coordinator Questionnaire Results	139
III-10	Grades for Total Student Sample	146
III-11	Grades by Schools	149
III-12	Grades by Residency Type	154
III-13	Grades by Special Populations	161
III-14	Attendance: Pre Versus During Residency	167
III-15	Attendance: Workshop Versus Non-Workshop Days	168
III-16	Writing Analysis	169

I. INTRODUCTION

Theoretical literatures, expert opinion, and educational practice all suggest that the arts play an important role in education (e.g., Cohen & Gainer, 1984; Eisner, 1972, 1979, 1980; Kindler, 1987; Steveni, 1968). While there are published reports of empirical studies showing the relationship between arts education and learning outcomes (e.g., Brunk & Denton, 1983), such reports are relatively scarce.

This scarcity is due, in part, to the difficulty of validly assessing the effects of arts education. Standardized measures are often insensitive to specific program goals and the effects of arts education programs are often confounded with the effects of other programs--programs which may be more embedded in the school structure than community-based arts education programs.

The Music Center of Los Angeles County, Education Division (MCED) is active in the schools of Los Angeles County. It offers a variety of programs, including an artists-in-the-schools program. Through its contracting of this study, which was generously supported by California Community Foundation and Mervyn's, the MCED affords a unique opportunity to identify or develop valid instruments and procedures for evaluating program effects. Since the study particularly targeted schools identified as having high percentages of minority students and students of low socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds, it additionally offers insights for working with such traditionally underserved students.

Purpose and Guiding Issues

The purposes of this study, were to (a) document the effects of The Music Center of Los Angeles County, Education Division's (MCED's) Artists-in-Residence Program, (b) inform program planning and revision, and (c) provide a compendium of evaluation strategies.

The primary questions guiding the study asked whether involvement in an MCED residency enabled students to:

- learn the material presented by the artists and/or obtain knowledge and skills that transfer to the classroom?
- maintain or gain in their self-expression/communication abilities?
- maintain or gain in higher order thinking skills such as ability to identify problems, think divergently, and transfer learning to new situations?
- develop positive affect and attitudes such as self-esteem and motivation to learn?

- develop social skills such as cultural awareness and cooperative behavior?

Two additional question sets were posed about program processes and implementation:

- How is the school-artist partnership aspect of the residency program implemented and to what extent is the partnership concept important to program participants?

- What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of the program and what are suggestions for building on the strengths and improving the weaknesses?

Limits of the Study

As with most studies of its kind, the field-based evaluation study described in this report has been necessarily limited in scope due to (a) the "real world," school-based context in which it was conducted and (b) the availability of resources, including human resources. Hence, while the results of the study provide a rich base of information, they should be interpreted in context. Likewise, while results of the study have important implications for continuing efforts in the area of arts education evaluation, they should not be over-generalized.

The conditions or limits which provide a context for the interpretation of the results of the MCED evaluation study follow. Including them is not meant to minimize the findings; rather, in the spirit of best research practice, the intent is to provide a context for increasing the valid interpretation of results.

Given the complexities of the school-based settings in which the study was necessarily conducted, it was not feasible to include a control group. Instead, this study employed a variety of methods, in keeping with best practice (e.g., Campbell & Stanley, 1966; Cook & Campbell, 1979), to increase the validity of findings. To illustrate, baseline data were collected so that teacher-assigned grades and attendance, for example, could be compared on a pre- versus post-residency basis; case study methodology was used to increase the richness of the data bases (Yin, 1989); and data were triangulated; i.e., a variety of methods were used to address the same research/evaluation issue so as to provide multiple evidence of particular outcomes.

Another caution or limit to the interpretation of findings is the fact that the evaluation study was confined to the MCED's Artists-in-Residence program. However, the decision to confine the study was intended to enhance the integrity of results; compared to its companion programs, the Artists-in-Residence program is relatively comprehensive and its period of classroom duration (8-16 weeks) allows for comparisons over time.

A third limit involved the difficulty of obtaining timely access to student records. For example, in order to respect the rights of students and the scheduling and staffing needs of participating schools, the report card and attendance had to be collected during the few days following the end of school in June by a limited number of individuals. Therefore, the scope of such data collection was dictated by considerations of feasibility. As a result, while the sample of students included in this study certainly represents the underserved populations particularly targeted by the MCED's programs, it is not necessarily representative of all students in general.

Finally, it is important to understand that not all results, positive or otherwise, may be directly or entirely attributable to the MCED program. For example, in addition to participating in the MCED's program, schools may have additionally participated in a number of other enrichment and/or remedial programs (e.g., Bilingual Education, California Writing Project). A reasonable hypothesis is that together these programs reinforce one another and have synergistic effects.

Organization of the Report

The remaining chapters of this report describe the methods used to conduct the study, the results of the study, and a summary of conclusions and recommendations. The content of the Methods and Results chapters is technical in nature and is, therefore, reported according to the conventions of technical report writing. For example, the

Methods chapter is at a level of technical detail sufficient for replication purposes and the Results chapter is confined to direct reports of technical findings, usually in terms of statistical significance; the interpretation of findings occurs in the final chapter. The main points of the technical chapters are summarized in the Executive Summary.

The technical chapters are followed by the various tables cited throughout the report, a list of references, and several appendices. The appendices provide a compendium of evaluation strategies which resulted from the study, an annotated bibliography in support of the methods used to conduct the study, and other detailed information that may be of interest to some readers (e.g., transcriptions of open-ended comments from the various questionnaires).

II. METHODS

This chapter is technical in nature and describes the methods used to conduct the study. It includes information about participants in the study, the design of the study, and the instruments and procedures involved in data collection as well as descriptions of various developmental activities. Since the evaluation study contracted by The Music Center of Los Angeles County's Education Division (MCED) required creative approaches to assessing program effects, developmental efforts were necessary and appropriate. It is hoped that some of these efforts may provide springboards for continuing development by others who are interested in furthering valid and useful arts education evaluation.

Findings based on the application of the methods described in this chapter are reported in the Results chapter. Conclusions and recommendations, based on the interpretation of results, are presented in the final chapter of the report.

The MCED evaluation study occurred in four phases and used a multimethod approach. It was conducted by a team of researchers from the University of California at Los Angeles's Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE). The team consisted of a Ph.D. project director, two graduate student assistants, and various technical and clerical assistants.

The MCED's Artists-in-Residence program was the focus of the study. The reasons for its selection, over other MCED programs, include the following: it encompasses a wide range of artists and arts education experiences; it can be adapted to the needs of different groups (e.g., age levels); it is implemented in a wide variety of schools, particularly schools identified as having a high percentage of minority and low SES (socioeconomic status) students; the number and variety of residencies provide opportunities for in-depth case studies of specific MCED program-wide goals; and, compared to other MCED programs, its structure allows for the most reliable assessment of the Center's educational goals. For example, the 8-16 week duration of a residency allows for the tracking of students' knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes over a period of time.

During the 1989-90 school year, the MCED's Artists-in-Residence program included 25 artists representing five disciplines: dance, drama, music, visual arts, and writing. Over the course of the year, residencies were placed in 221 classrooms located within 31 schools. These schools served students in grades kindergarten through nine.

For purposes of this study, the 16 residencies that were scheduled for May or June completion were invited to participate in the collection of survey data. These residencies were staffed by nine different artists and were located in 65 classrooms across 11 schools. While not all such residencies were able to participate, survey data were obtained for over 500 students and more than 50 teachers. Report card grades and attendance data were collected for students in 27 classrooms, and in-depth case studies involved five artists and selected students from more than 14 classrooms.

The methods used throughout the study (e.g., surveys, interviews, analyses of report card grades and attendance data) intersected with the phases of the study. The methods were specifically selected or designed to address the research and evaluation questions at hand. The remainder of this chapter provides an overview of the study's design and describes each phase of the study with regard to the following: research and evaluation goals and questions, research design, participants, and data collection sources and procedures.

Overall Design of the Study

As stated in the Introduction, the study was designed to meet three purposes: (a) document MCED program effects by collecting and summarizing data regarding the extent to which the program's goals are being met; (b) provide information than can contribute to effective planning and decision-making; and (c) provide a compendium of evaluation strategies and procedures that were developed throughout the course of the study and which may be used or adapted for future applications by the MCED and/or others. Each phase of the study was designed to contribute to the achievement of these purposes by addressing specific questions as set forth in the remainder of this chapter.

Together, the four phases of the study spanned from October, 1989-September, 1990. The phases occurred as follows: Phase I, 10/89-12/89; Phase II, 12/89-6/90; Phase III, 1/90-7/90; and Phase IV, 8/90-9/90. In order to meet the requirements of data collection in school-based settings and to accommodate the complex scheduling needs of the MCED, participating artists, and participating schools, the phases overlapped in time. The four phases of the study were as follows:

1. determination of the parameters of the study;
2. design of the evaluation study and identification or development of methods and procedures for carrying out the design;
3. collection of data as indicated by the design; and
4. analyses, interpretation, and summarization of findings.

In general, data collection involved two kinds of methods: quantitative, broadscale methods; and more qualitative, case study methods. Quantitative, broadscale data collection methods--based on grades, attendance, and surveys--were applied to as many residencies as feasible and were used to address a number of accountability or "what" questions. For example: "What difference does the program make with regard to particular outcomes such as grades, attendance, classroom behavior, or self-concept?"

More qualitative, methods--based on classroom observations, interviews, and analysis of writing samples--were applied on a case study basis. These methods were used to lend meaning to the broadscale data and to address a number of "how" and "why" questions. For example: "Why does participation in the arts seem to improve students' classroom attitudes? How can we apply what happens during arts instruction to other types of instruction and learning?"

The instruments and procedures used throughout the study are included in Appendix A. The specific numbers and kinds of participants included in each data collection procedure are described in the following sections of this chapter. Each section provides, by phase, descriptions of research/evaluation goals, research/evaluation questions, research/evaluation activities, and participants in the activities.

Phase I: Program Clarification and Needs Assessment

Goals

The goals of Phase I were to (a) delineate the parameters of the study by carefully examining the MCED's evaluation needs and feasible approaches for meeting them; (b) review literature on arts education programs in order to determine the relationship between the content of the MCED's programs and the parameters of best practice; and (c) review relevant assessment literature in order to identify instruments and procedures having potential for valid applications in the MCED evaluation study.

Questions

Questions addressed by Phase I included the following:

1. What are the goals of the evaluation study?
2. In light of the evaluation goals and given the limits of the resources available to the study, what aspects of the program are both important and reasonable to evaluate?
3. What are the defining features of the "program" selected for evaluation (i.e., specifically what is/is not being evaluated under the auspices of the study)?
4. To what extent does the content of the evaluated program reflect best practice as reported in the professional literature?
5. What arts education evaluation procedures or instruments exist for validly assessing the extent to which the MCED program is meeting the evaluation goals?

Activities and Participants

Activities and participants are organized below according to the evaluation question or questions they were designed to address.

What are the Goals of the Evaluation Study?

In order to identify and clarify both the explicit and implicit goals of the program, the CSE team reviewed written MCED program descriptions; viewed videotapes of MCED program-related activities; interviewed MCED program developers and staff; observed artists-in-residence working with classrooms of students; attended residency planning meetings which included school personnel, artists, and MCED representatives; and interviewed artists, principals, teachers, and students participating in the program. The formats used in observing classrooms and planning/evaluation meetings are provided in Appendix A.

These activities occurred in October and November, 1989. The result was a categorization of goals into the following domains:

1. *Cognitive* -- the development of factual knowledge and skills related to the arts instruction provided by the artist-in-residence and/or to classroom instruction in basic content and skill areas such as reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, etc.
2. *Communication* -- The abilities to understand and to express ideas through writing, speech, and/or body language.
3. *Higher Order Thinking*: -- The abilities to think creatively, solve "real world" problems, and generalize knowledge from workshop to workshop and from arts

instruction to other situations such as classroom learning and out-of-school activities.

4. *Attitudes and affect*: -- Emotional development to include positive self-concept, motivation to learn, task engagement, enjoyment of learning.
5. *Socialization* -- the development of socialization skills and appreciation such as cultural awareness, appreciation of alternative perspectives, and cooperation.
6. *Partnership* -- teacher and artist collaboration in the ongoing planning and implementation of instructional activities (e.g., joint planning of residency activities; teacher participation in residency workshops; classroom follow-up to residency activities; integration of residency and classroom instruction). The partnership concept also includes parent awareness and involvement with their children and the school.

What Aspects of the Program are Important and Reasonable to Evaluate?

On the basis of their document and tape reviews, observations, and interviews, the CSE research team -- in consultation with MCED staff -- determined that it would be useful to evaluate selected outcomes from each of the Domains described above. This decision required the development of instruments and procedures since existing measures were deemed insufficiently valid for meeting the MCED's needs.

For example, standardized achievement tests are routinely used in the schools served by the MCED. However, these tests provide inadequate measures of higher order skills, are limited in the content areas which they assess, are likely to be insensitive to project effects, and are administered at times that do not allow for accurate pre and post evaluations of relatively short-term interventions such as an 8-16 week residency.

The selection of outcomes targeted for assessment within each Domain were specified during Phase II of the study and are described later in this chapter. The development of related instruments and procedures are also described in conjunction with Phase II of the study.

What are the Defining Features of the "Program"?

In order to interpret the data resulting from an evaluation study, it is imperative to clarify what is and is not being evaluated; that is, what does and does not constitute the program. The MCED Artists-in-Residence program was defined as follows. Each residency consists of an artist who collaborates with school personnel to develop a series of "workshops" or class sessions in the artist's discipline area (e.g., dance, music). These workshops are presented in the classrooms of collaborating teachers over an 8- to 16-week period of time. Most workshops span a normal class period, usually 45-60 minutes.

The MCED's goals for the residencies are listed below along with their associated goal domains:

- reinforce basic learning and cooperative group skills (associated domains: cognitive; communication; socialization)
- improve student achievement through enhanced self-esteem (associated domains: cognitive; attitudes & affect);
- expand student problem solving, creative expression, and critical thinking abilities (associated domains: higher order thinking; communication)
- increase teachers' skills and knowledge of the arts in education curriculum (associated domains: partnership).
- increase multi-cultural awareness, understanding, and tolerance (associated domains: socialization).
- increase the awareness and involvement of parents with their children and the school (associated domains: partnership).

According to MCED criteria, desirable residency components include the following:

- a recommended minimum of 12 days of activities over a three-month period;
- a total of 48 workshop sessions involving an artist, four core teachers and their classrooms within a school.
- one or more staff workshops focusing on techniques for relating the arts to basic classroom instruction or

parent workshops that involve families in the residency process;

- a performance related to the chosen art form or theme;
- a culminating event in which the artist and students demonstrate work accomplished during the residency; and
- a series of artist/teacher meetings to assess the ongoing needs of the students and to plan and develop curriculum content for follow-up workshops and other classroom activities.

To What Extent Does the Content of the Evaluated Program Reflect High Quality Practice?

A review of literature and programs was conducted to determine the extent to which the MCED's Artist-in-Residence program reflects acceptable practice. A review of programs such as those offered by the Los Angeles County Museum, the Boston Children's Museum, and the Chicago Art Institute as well as the annotated bibliography contained in Appendix B suggest that the MCED's program is exemplary in intent and content.

What Existing Instruments or Procedures may be Validly Applied to the MCED Evaluation Study?

A number of reliable instruments exist for assessing constructs implied by the MCED's goals--constructs such as self-esteem, writing ability, and cognitive knowledge. However, instruments peculiar to the needs of the MCED's evaluation study were not located. To illustrate, a writing residency was included as a case study. The residency included language minority children. A major goal of the collaborating teachers and the artist was to increase students' awareness and acceptance of their feelings and build self-confidence and, hence, the willingness to express themselves in writing. Writing produced throughout the residency was not to be graded. In other words, writing was used as a vehicle for affective change. While improving the mechanics of writing was considered desirable, such improvement was also considered incidental to the goals of the residency.

In this case, the evaluation need was to assess the effects of engaging in the writing process on outcomes other than writing per se and to be able to do so on the basis of naturally occurring residency or classroom assignments. A number of procedures are available for the reliable analysis of writing quality (e.g., California Assessment Program; Quelmalz & Burry, 1983; Redfield, Holt, & Martray, 1987). However, these procedures (a) are based on standardized prompts or writing tasks rather than on routine writing assignments and/or (b) focus on the quality of writing as an end rather than as evidence of other outcomes (e.g., self-esteem).

As a result of reviewing existing instrumentation, the CSE team decided to use some existing data sources, develop some new instrumentation or adapt existing instrumentation for use in the evaluation study, and insofar as possible, try out ideas for future development. Existing data sources included report grades and attendance data. MCED evaluation questionnaires previously used by teachers and school administrators to evaluate the program were modified for use in the evaluation study. The following instruments and procedures resulted from developmental activities and were used to collect data for inclusion in the MCED evaluation study: student and artist questionnaires; shadowing protocol for conducting systematic, in-depth behavioral observations; a Writing Analysis System (WAS) for using writing as a tool to assess outcomes related to the MCED's goal domains; and videotape analysis procedures. Additional procedures that were explored on a preliminary level and which hold promise for future development efforts included a problem solving simulation activity, teacher and artist logs for describing the nature of their partnership experiences, and parent questionnaires. Copies of these instruments are provided in Appendix A.

Phase II: Design and Development Activities

Goals and Questions

The goals of Phase II of the study were to (a) design the study and (b) identify or develop instruments and procedures for collecting the data specified by the design. Specific questions addressed by Phase II included the following:

1. What data will be collected?
2. What are the data sources?
3. Who will collect which data?
4. How will the data be collected?
5. When will the data be collected?
6. How will the data be analyzed?

Activities and Participants

Activities and participants are organized below according to the evaluation question or questions they were designed to address. Together, the answers to these questions constitute the design of the study.

What Data Will Be Collected?

Data collection was determined by the needs of the MCED's program goals as delineated in Phase I of the study. The data sources providing evidence of outcomes in each domain are specified in Table II-1. The Table also indicates the availability of each instrument or procedure and the scope of the data collection associated with each -- i.e., broadscale versus case study.

Insert Table II-1 about here

What are the Data Sources?

This question addresses the issue of from whom or about whom data should be collected. It was especially important to the MCED to gather information about ethnic and language minority students participating in the program. Hence, schools having relatively high percentages of such populations were particularly targeted for inclusion in various aspects of the study. It was also desirable to include residencies from a variety of grade levels and arts disciplines.

In selecting participants for inclusion in Phase III of the study, a schedule of all residencies for 1989-90 was obtained (Appendix C). Because of the Phase I and II needs to engage in clarification and development activities, the list of residencies available for Phase III data collection was narrowed to those scheduled between January and June, 1990. From the narrowed list, residencies representing the populations of concern to the MCED, a variety of grade levels, and a variety of residency types were sampled for inclusion in Phase III of the study. In some cases, selections were limited. For example, only one music residency met Phase III scheduling requirements and most residencies in the narrowed list represented elementary grade levels. However, during Phases I and II, the full list was drawn upon to provide background information which was used to inform ensuing design, development, and data gathering activities. The kinds of residencies included the various data collection efforts are described in Table II-2.

Insert Table II-2 about here

In addition to the data collection efforts depicted in Table II-2, questionnaire data were invited from all residencies from which valid responses could be expected. It would not, for example, be appropriate to expect young children to reliably respond to a questionnaire about a residency ending several weeks or months prior. In all, questionnaires were obtained from 501 students, 56 teachers, 13 artists, 19 administrators (principals and school-residency coordinators), and 21 parents. Given the limited number of artists, administrators, and teachers participating in residencies ending in May or June, 1990, the return rates were notably adequate. While the return rate for parent questionnaires was relatively low, these questionnaires were used on a preliminary basis only for purposes of gathering information useful to revising and refining the questionnaires. Nonetheless, the data yielded by the 21 parent questionnaires was consistent and provides useful clues regarding parents thoughts and attitudes toward the Program.

Who Collected the Data?

Data were collected by members of the CSE research team. While, in some cases, these efforts were facilitated by MCED staff or school personnel, care was taken to minimize any potential bias associated with such assistance. For example, MCED staff printed and distributed questionnaires to the school-MCED coordinators at the school sites designated by the CSE research team. The completed questionnaires, however, were not completed in the presence of MCED staff and they were returned directly and anonymously to the CSE project director.

How Were the Data Collected?

The procedures associated with each data source are detailed in Appendix A which contains copies of the various data collection instruments. For the reader's convenience, a brief summary follows.

Questionnaires. The Student, Artist, Teacher, Administrator, and School-Residency Coordinator Questionnaires were distributed through the School-Residency Coordinators at the routinely scheduled end-of-residency evaluation meetings for those residencies ending in May or June, 1990. These meetings are attended by the artist, participating teachers, school-MCED coordinator, MCED staff, and, whenever possible, the school principal. In some cases, a member of the CSE research team was also present as an observer.

Parent Questionnaires were distributed, on a trial basis, to parents attending the end-of-residency culminating events at the schools described in Table II-2. In all cases, questionnaire respondents were assured anonymity. Copies of the questionnaires appear in Appendix A.

Grades and attendance. Report card grades and attendance data were obtained by members of the CSE research team. Data collection was confined to schools in which other forms of data collection were in progress and which were able to give permission for such data collection. Altogether, grade and attendance data were obtained from four different schools, each of which housed multiple residencies.

The decision to limit the collection of grade and attendance data to these sites was based on the need to have a context within which to interpret the findings and due to the limited resources available for collecting the data within the time-frame required by school schedules. That is, most of these data had to be collected, on site, within a few days following the close of school in June. In all cases, student anonymity was protected by removing identifying information from the data.

Observations. Several residencies were observed as background for the development of an observation protocol.

The data from these observations were ethnographic in nature and relevant findings are reported in the Results chapter of this report. Using the ethnographic data as a background, the Shadowing Protocol (i.e., classroom observation form and instructions) contained in Appendix A were drafted. The protocol was subsequently used to shadow three, 13- to 16-year-old special education students and three second-grade students on three occasions each throughout the course of a residency. Shadowing is a particularly useful technique for systematically obtaining a rich data base regarding the behaviors of particular students. Such data bases are critical to understanding the results of other data-based findings, documenting the progress of targeted individuals, and developing program interventions.

Briefly, the Shadowing Protocol developed for trial use in this study allows an observer to systematically monitor behaviors that are related to the MCED's goals. The protocol may be used to shadow individual students or groups of individual students. The protocol includes the following categories of behavioral outcomes: Cognitive Knowledge and Skills, Higher Order Thinking, Communication Skills, Affect and Attitudes, and Socialization. To illustrate, the behavioral indicators associated with the self-esteem (in the Affects & Attitudes domain) include volunteering, working independently, appropriately asking for help, appropriately giving help, and praising, supporting and/or encouraging others.

Writing. Writing portfolios produced by 110 students in three fourth-grade classes and one fourth-/fifth-grade combination class participating in an MCED writing/drama residency were obtained. The residency was housed in a school having a relatively high percentage of minority students (71% hispanic, 13% asian, 11% caucasian, 5% other) and one of the school's goals for the residency was improved expression and communication.

To protect student anonymity, all identifying information was removed from the writing samples. The residency from which the portfolios were drawn included approximately 16 hours of instruction with the amount of time devoted to writing and dramatization being approximately equal. Fifty students' portfolios were randomly selected for in-depth analysis.

Selected writing samples generated by similar, but not identical, assignments made early and later in the residency were selected and used to field test the proposed writing analysis protocol. Following reliability analyses, the full set of writing samples was then used to assess changes over time.

Problem solving simulations. Based on artist and teacher interviews and classroom observations, a problem solving simulation was developed for use on a trial basis with a group of 10 first-grade students chosen at random.

Briefly, the simulation consisted of posing a problem situation to the group of students and eliciting potential solutions. The situation revolved around a classroom party when not enough refreshments were provided. Given the preliminary nature of this effort, results take the form of recommendations for future planning only.

Videotape analyses. The CSE team videotaped workshops occurring within the first and last three weeks of two separate residencies by a dancer and a visual artist. The dance residency involved four classes of fourth-grade students and was housed in a school having a large hispanic population (71%). The visual arts residency involved four classes of first-grade students and was housed in a school having a large black population (70%).

The tapes were subsequently viewed by the CSE project director for qualitative changes in student behavior over time. Findings are reported in the Results chapter. In the future, the tapes may be additionally used to establish the reliability of raters using the Shadowing Protocol or to illustrate findings from other data sources.

Focus group interviews. The procedure developed by Krueger (1986) was modified and used to interview three groups of students who had experienced multiple residencies or similar MCED programs. A group interview format was chosen for the sake of efficiency. A major purpose of these interviews was to determine the long-term impact of multiple arts education experiences.

Each interview group consisted of from eight to ten students. Two groups consisted of eighth- and ninth-grade students in a largely hispanic intermediate school (80%). A third group consisted of high school students from the same school district.

Krueger's procedure calls for an interviewer and a backup interviewer who observes the interview and serves to validate the interviewer's impressions. All interviews were conducted by the same interviewer pair. The protocol that was used appears in Appendix A.

Teacher and artist Logs. The Teacher and Artist Log forms shown in Appendix A were used on a trial basis to determine the nature of the teacher-artist partnership for purposes of future planning. The forms were distributed at Residency Planning Meetings by MCED staff. The results of the completed forms are summarized in the Results chapter.

Meeting observation forms. CSE team members developed forms to systematize their separate observations of the Planning and Evaluation Meetings associated with the residencies. The resulting data were used in the formulation of recommendations as reported in the final chapter of this report. Copies of the forms may be found in Appendix A.

When Were the Data Collected?

Needs assessment data used to inform the design of the study were collected from October, 1989 through December, 1989. These data included observations of residency planning meetings, classroom observations, and interviews with MCED staff, school personnel, and artists.

Classroom observation, videotape, writing, focus group interview, and meeting observation data were collected throughout Phase III of the study--between January and June, 1990. Questionnaires were distributed in May and June; a problem solving simulation trial was scheduled for early June; teacher and artist logs were obtained by mid-June; and grade and attendance data were collected at the close of school in late June.

How Were the Data Analyzed?

The findings associated with the ethnographic and other qualitative data, such as Focus Group Interviews, are based on best practice as reported in the professional literature and on critical analyses. The quantitative data were analyzed statistically. While details of each analysis accompany the findings reported in the Results chapter of this report, a brief summary follows.

Questionnaire, report card grade, attendance, and writing data were analyzed using the frequency, crosstab, and t-test subprograms of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.(Nie, Hull, Jenkins et al., 1975).

These subprograms index the number of respondents selecting each response to an item, provide descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations) for specified groups, and compare group means for statistically significant differences. For purposes of the MCED evaluation study, statistical significance was defined as less than or equal to .05, meaning that the probability of a particularly finding being due to chance alone is .05 or less. This level ($p \leq .05$) is typical of social science research.

Videotape, focus group interview, and observational data (i.e., classroom observations, shadowing protocols, planning/evaluation meeting observations) were reviewed critically, using standards of best practice. Experiences with the problem solving simulation effort, teacher logs, and parent questionnaires were examined for their usefulness to future planning and development efforts.

Phase III: Data Collection Procedures

Goals, Questions, Activities and Participants

The goal of Phase III was to collect data to help answer the questions which guided the study. Table II-3 summarizes the activities and participants associated with this phase of the study.

Insert Table II-3 about here

Phase IV: Data Analyses

Goals and Questions

The goal of Phase IV was to analyze, interpret, and report the data collected during preceding phases of the study. The purpose of doing so was to answer the questions listed above, under Phase III Goals and Questions, in ways that are useful to the MCED, its constituencies, and similar programs.

Activities and Participants

Data analysis activities and the participants associated with each data set undergoing analysis are described above under the description of Phases II and III. They will be reiterated in the Results chapter as findings are reported. Data analysis activities are summarized in Table II-4 according to data source.

Insert Table II-4 about here

III. RESULTS

In this chapter, results of data collection and analyses procedures are reported according to data source. These results are discussed and summarized as they pertain to the questions that guided the study overall in the Conclusions and Recommendations chapter. The following definitions statistical terms and symbols necessary to understanding the results presented in this chapter follow.

n: number of participants. For example, if completed questionnaires were received from 500 students, then n=500.

t: a value yielded by a statistical procedure ("t-test") that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two summary statistics such as means or average percents. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p as described below.

p: the probability that the difference represented by t (or some other statistical test of significance) is due to chance. In social science research, results are usually considered statistically significant if p is less than or equal to .05 ($p \leq .05$). All things being equal, the larger the sample (n) on which a t value is based, the greater the likelihood of statistically significant findings. Hence, with very large samples, statistically significant differences may not be particularly meaningful. In the case of the MCED study, most samples were relatively small.

Questionnaire Results

Separate questionnaires were developed for, and administered to, each of the following groups: students, teachers, artists, parents, administrators (e.g.,prinicpals), and school-residency coordinators. The results of each of these surveys are summarized in Tables III-1 through III-9 and are narratively highlighted later in this chapter.

In each case (i.e., student survey, teacher survey, etc.), a table is provided which summarizes the mean response and standard deviation for each item on the questionnaire for all respondents combined. The number and percent of respondents selecting each response to each item is also indicated.

Given the relatively large number of respondents to the student questionnaire (n=506), results are further reported by grade level, residency type (e.g., dance), and school. It should be noted that any ethnic differences.reported in the findings by schools, are likely to be confounded or confused by differences between the various schools included in the study, and should be considered as suggestive only.

Questionnaire results based on respondents other than students are reported for all respondents combined only.

Breakdowns by school, grade level, etc. are comparatively meaningless given the relatively small number of respondents (e.g., 54 teachers) and could result in the unintentional identification of respondents, thereby violating their rights to privacy.

To facilitate interpretation of results, the entries in Tables III-1 through III-9 grouped by goal domains (e.g., cognitive knowledge/skills, communication). The analyses for each item were based on valid responses only. If, for example, a student selected more than one response to an item, that student's response was considered invalid and was excluded from the analyses for that item. This convention was followed for all analyses described in this report.

When an item mean is 2.00 or lower, it may be interpreted that respondents, overall, disagreed with the item statement, i.e., they either strongly disagreed (1.00) or disagreed (2.00). When an item mean is 3.00 or higher, it may be interpreted that respondents, overall agreed with the item statement, i.e., they either agreed (3.00) or strongly agreed (4.00). When item means fall between 2.00 and 3.00, interpretation is facilitated by examining the percent of students yielding responses of 1.00 or 2.00 versus those responding with 3.00 or 4.00.

To illustrate, an examination of results for item #22 in Table III-1 indicates a mean response of 2.76 which falls between 2.00 and 3.00. Since 26.5% of the students strongly agreed and 36.3% of the students agreed with the item, it may be concluded that a majority of the students (62.8%) agreed that since working with an Artist-in-Residence they participate more in class.

Copies of the questionnaires are included in Appendix A. Appendix D provides a transcript of open-ended responses written by the various respondents in the "comments" section of the questionnaires.

Student Questionnaires

Responses were received from 506 students in grades four through nine across eight schools. The majority of responses (n=494) were from students in grades four through six and were based on residencies with eight different artists across four arts disciplines: Dance, Drama, Visual Arts, and Writing/Drama. Due to the unreliability of questionnaire data yielded by young children, surveys were not developed for use with students in grades three or lower. However, in the future, a downward extension of the Student Questionnaire developed for use in this study may be possible. In short, the sample of surveyed students was limited to students above third grade in residencies ending in May or June, 1990 and whose teachers were willing to administer the questionnaires.

Table III-1 presents the findings for all students combined. As shown in the table, of the 28 items on the Student Questionnaire, no items obtained means of 2.00 or lower. Furthermore, over a third of the 28 items (n=10) obtained mean values of 3.00 or higher and 72% of the items obtaining means between 2.00 and 3.00 had a majority of responses in the 3.00 and 4.00 categories.

Insert Table III-1 about here

Considered as a whole, the results presented in Table III-1 show that students reported that, in conjunction with participating in a residency, they felt that they gained in knowledge and skills; experienced positive feelings of self-confidence, self-esteem, pride in their accomplishments, and enjoyment in learning; were motivated to work hard and actively engage and participate in the workshop activities; clearly understood the artists' expectations; and perceived their teachers as active participants in the residency workshops presented by the artists.

Results also suggest that students gained higher order skills (e.g., used what they learned from the artist to help them with their schoolwork and out-of-school activities); positive attitudes (e.g., the desire to spend more time with the artist and to work with other artists, improved motivation to try harder in school, increased class participation); communication (e.g., talking with parents about their experience with the artist); and socialization (e.g., getting along better with others and being of more help to other students). Students also seemed to view their teachers and the artists as partners in that they (a) described their teachers and artists as planning together for the workshops and (b) reported that teachers made assignments related to the artists' presentations and that artists' presentations were relevant to classroom activities.

In general, the residencies did not seem to influence students to want to become artists. Neither did students report seeking out additional information or reading more about the arts as a result of the residency experience.

Tables III-2 through III-4 summarize the student questionnaire results by school, grade level, and type of residency respectively. These results generally conform to those reported in Table III-1.

Insert Table III-2 through III-4 about here

Comparisons based on tables III-2 through III-4 should be made with caution, especially given the relatively small number of respondents in some groups (i.e., schools, grade levels, residency types) and the fact that variables other than the MCED residencies (e.g., student background) undoubtedly influenced the findings. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that, (a) compared to other students, special education students especially enjoyed working with the artists and particularly felt that their work with the artist helped them with their other school work; (b) special education students and students in schools with high hispanic enrollments (80-95%) were most inclined to perceive their teachers and the artists as partners and their teachers as active participants in the residency experience; and (c) students in a school having a high percentage of minority and low SES (socioeconomic status) students reported the least self-confidence (Table III-2).

This latter finding warrants the acknowledgement that self-esteem and related variables are developed in early childhood and are very stable. The implication is that once established, they are very difficult to change. This is not to say that such constructs are not worth changing or cannot be changed; it is to say that change usually requires intensive and long-term intervention.

Table III-3 indicates that sixth-graders were less likely than their fourth- or fifth-grade counterparts to perceive their teachers as active participants in the residency experience. The table also suggests that fourth-graders, the youngest Student Questionnaire respondents, reported being least confident of their abilities to be successful at whatever tasks they tried.

Of particular note from table III-4 are the findings that, compared to other respondents, students in Writing/Drama residencies perceived what they had learned as less applicable to their out-of-school activities; students participating in visual arts residencies were more likely to perceive their teachers and the artists as partners; and students participating in Dance and Visual Arts residencies reported more feelings of self-confidence compared to those participating in Writing and/or Drama residencies. While these findings may be influenced by students' perceptions of the relationship between the workshop activities and their normal classroom activities, they may also or otherwise be a function of the dynamics between particular artists and the students or the nature of the content and skills represented by the various arts.

Teacher Questionnaires

Teacher Questionnaires were distributed, via the school-MCED coordinators, to teachers participating in a residency that ended in May or June, 1990. Responses from 54 teachers were directly submitted to the CSE evaluation team. The findings are presented in Table III-5.

Insert Table III-5 about here

In brief, Table III-5 indicates that responding teachers report being present at nearly all of their students' workshops with the artists, actively participating in most of the workshops, and collaborating with the artists on more than half of the workshops. Teachers definitely agreed (mean ratings of 3.00 or higher) that collaboration between teachers and artists is important to the success of the residencies; students learned the knowledge and skills presented by the artists; the knowledge and skills taught by the artists generalized to students' classroom performance; students enjoyed the experience; students increased in their appreciation of the arts and gained more positive self-attitudes as a result of their work with the artists; students gained in willingness to express themselves orally and in writing; that the program's emphasis on the creative process over the production of polished products is/was appropriate; and that the program is well managed.

In no case was an item mean on the Teacher Questionnaire 2.00 or lower, indicating that teachers' perceptions about and attitudes toward the program are quite positive. The only item for which the percentage of disagree and strongly disagree responses exceeded the percentage of agree and strongly agree responses concerns the extent to which teachers perceive students as being more cooperative overall since working with an artist (item #41). The greatest problem identified by teachers was the limited time available for ongoing, regular planning/evaluation of residency-related activities.

Artist Questionnaires

Artist Questionnaires were distributed to artists participating in residencies ending in May or June, 1990. Completed questionnaires were received from 13 artists. While this number appears small, it actually represents more than the number of targeted artists (n=11), i.e., those artists completing a residency during May or June, 1990. Findings are summarized in Table III-6.

Insert Table III-6 about here

Briefly, Table III-6 indicates that, with the exception of two items, all mean responses were 3.00 or above. One exception concerns the nature of the end-of-residency program or performance known as the "culminating event" (item #26). In general, the artists did not perceive these performances as the target of the residencies. This finding is positive with regard to the MCED's goal of emphasizing process over product.

The other exception concerns the nature of the teacher-artist partnership. As shown by artists' mean responses to items #10 and 11, in particular, artists saw themselves as planning most of the workshops.

Parent Questionnaires

While the Parent Questionnaire was intended as a developmental activity aimed at gathering information to refine the questionnaire and its administration/distribution, the consistency of the results of the trial administration are worth noting. Draft copies of the questionnaire were distributed to parents attending culminating events for residencies ending in May or June, 1990. Questionnaires were completed and submitted by 21 parents from eight different schools.

In general, the results summarized in Table III-7 are positive toward the importance of arts education and the benefits experienced by the children of the responding parents. Notably, results should be interpreted in context. For example, due to the developmental/experimental nature of the questionnaires, they were distributed at school sites during school hours to parents who willingly attended a program/performance in which their children were participants. Hence, the responses may be more representative of a relatively "select" group of parents rather than of all parents having children enrolled in the schools targeted by the MCED evaluation study.

Insert Table III-7 about here

Administrator Questionnaires

Administrator Questionnaires were distributed to the 11 principals of schools participating in residencies that ended in May or June, 1990. Completed questionnaires were received from 9 of the 11 principals. Findings are presented in Table III-8.

Insert Table III-8 about here

The findings summarized in Table III-8 indicate that responding principals report being present at nearly all meetings associated with the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the residencies in their schools. On the 4-point, strongly agree-strongly disagree scale, principals' mean responses across all such items ranged from 3.89-3.00 indicating highly positive attitudes toward outcomes related to the teacher-artist partnership; students' cognitive knowledge and skills, higher order thinking, and affects and attitudes; and program management and implementation. Principals were especially favorable in their opinions about the artists' effectiveness with students (M=3.89). The greatest problem identified by administrators, as with teachers, was the limited time available for ongoing, regular planning/evaluation of residency-related activities.

School-Residency Coordinator Questionnaires

School-Residency Coordinators are school personnel who function as liaisons between the MCED and the teachers participating in the residencies. In some cases, the principal functions as the Coordinator; but, in most cases, it is the counselor, curriculum coordinator, or one of the participating teachers.

Coordinator Questionnaires were distributed to School-Residency Coordinators participating in a residency that ended in May or June, 1990. Completed questionnaires were received from 10 of the 11 Coordinators participating in residencies that ended in May or June, 1990. The findings, are presented in Table III-9.

Insert Table III-9 about here

The findings summarized in Table III-9 indicate that the Coordinators report participating in most all residency-related activities such as planning and evaluation meetings and they perceived scheduling to be their greatest problem. Otherwise, with one exception, the mean response to all items was 3.00 or higher. The one exception was item #30 concerning the benefit of the teacher workshops. It appears that Coordinators may have had difficulty responding to this item as not all residencies may have included such workshops and/or not all teachers may have been able to attend offered workshops.

Classroom Grades

Using report card information, achievement, effort, and work habits/cooperation grades were obtained for 358 students in 20 classrooms across three schools and six residencies. The schools represented minority populations targeted by the MCED study. The residencies represented all types offered by the MCED: Dance, Drama, Music, Visual Arts, and Writing/Drama.

Information was requested of three additional schools but was unobtainable for a variety of reasons. For example, school policies often inhibited timely permission for access to the records and limited human resources were available for on-site recording of the information from separately filed, individual student records during the few days in June that the records were available for review. Careful, and tedious, recording procedures were required to maintain the confidentiality of the data and to obtain the quality and detail of information required for the analyses included in the MCED evaluation study design.

Given the context, and associated limits, of data collection as described above, the obtained data are clearly relevant to the populations of particular interest to the

MCED's evaluation efforts, i.e., language minority and disadvantaged students and the sample is large enough for drawing some conclusions regarding similar populations. Report card grade data for all students combined are summarized in Table III-10.

Insert Table III-10 about here

As shown in Table III-10, statistically significant gains ($p \leq .05$) from the grading period immediately preceding the start of the various residencies to the grading period ending at or near the end of the residencies occurred in all areas of achievement: reading, written composition, spelling, handwriting, oral language, English as a second language, mathematics, science, social studies, health education, music, art, and physical education. Statistically significant gains were also shown for all corresponding effort grades except in the area of mathematics. Statistically significant gains in work habits/cooperation were shown in in the following areas: listening to and following instructions, finishing work on time, keeping own materials in order, dependability, assumption of responsibility for actions, respect for rights and property of others, courtesy, and obedience to school rules. The only conduct area not showing statistically significant gains was working and playing well with others.

Breakdowns by targeted schools, type of residency, and for special populations (e.g., students in bilingual education classes) are summarized in Tables III-11, III-12, and III-13, respectively. While horizontal (i.e., pre- to post-residency) comparisons are appropriate for each group, vertical comparisons (i.e., between group comparisons) are not.

Insert Tables III-11, III-12, and III-13 about here

In general, the results reported in Tables III-11, III-12, and III-13 reflect the overall findings reported in Table III-10. Notable exceptions are described below.

While all of the schools described by Table III-11 made a number of statistically significant gains with regard to teacher-assigned grades, only one school demonstrated statistically significant gains in all areas. Said school is an inner-city school with a high percentage of black students (70%); this school participates in a number of enrichment and remedial education programs.

Table III-12 suggests that regardless of residency type, all participants significantly ($p \leq .05$) improved in oral language effort, art achievement, and physical education achievement and effort. Since report card grades are assigned by classroom teachers and since the artists do not grade students' workshop performance, "art achievement" presumably refers to classroom, rather than residency, activities.

According to Table III-12, those students participating in the visual arts residencies were the only single group to show statistically significant gains in math effort, listening to and following directions, working and playing well with others, respecting the rights and property of others, courtesy, and obedience to school rules. These results may be confounded with the fact that all visual arts participants in this analysis were first-grade students.

Table III-13, presents results for students in classes designed for Asian speakers, Spanish speakers, bilingual students, and students in combined grade classes (e.g., second-third, third-fourth, fourth-fifth grade combinations). Most notably, these results suggest that students in combination classes are more similar, in terms of report card grades, to the population represented by the overall results (Table III-10). Results further indicate that the special populations represented by Table III-13 made no significant gains in conduct areas (e.g., following directions).

Attendance

Attendance records were obtained for 550 students in 25 classrooms across seven residencies and four schools. One school provided access to attendance data but did not provide access to report card data. Attendance data were analyzed in two ways. First, the proportion of days present/absent and tardy during the grading period immediately preceding a residency was compared to the proportion of days present/absent and tardy during the period of the residency. Second, the proportion of days students were absent, present, or tardy on workshop versus non-workshop days during the period of the residency were compared.

The overall results of the pre versus post analysis are summarized in Table III-14. These results indicate that, overall, students in regular classes were absent and tardy more frequently during the period of the residency. While the reasons for these findings are unknown, perhaps, attendance rates tend to decline over the course of the school year. All of the MCED evaluation data are based on residencies occuring during the Spring semester.

Insert Table III-14 about here

Additional analyses, based on various subgroups of students, indicate the following exceptions to the overall findings shown in Table III-14. These exceptions likely reflect differences between the participating schools or residencies rather than true demographic differences.

- In one school (n=58), having a 75% black and 25% hispanic enrollment, the proportion of days present during the period of the residency significantly exceeded the proportion of days present during the period preceding the residency.
- There were no significant differences between the two periods for students participating in the music residencies. This residency was housed at the school described above as having greater attendance during the period of the residency.
- There were no significant differences between periods for students in grades three and four.
- Students in bilingual education classes had higher attendance rates during the period of the residency (p=.05). There were no significant differences between periods for Asian speaking students or for students in combination-grade classes. Spanish speaking students were more absent more often during the period of the residency than during the period preceding the residency (p<.01).

Results of the attendance comparison for workshop versus non-workshop days during the residencies are summarized in Table III-15. For all students combined, these results show no significant differences in attendance or tardiness for workshop days compared to non-workshop days throughout the course of the various residencies. Additional analyses, based on various subgroups of students (e.g., by school, grade level, type of residency) indicated no exceptions to these findings.

Insert Table III-15 about here

Class and Student Observations

Classes of students were observed for behavioral changes over time either directly or via videotapes of workshop sessions with an artist-in-residence. Individual students were systematically observed for behavioral changes over time using the "shadowing" protocol included in Appendix A.

Classroom Observations

Each classroom selected for observation was observed for an entire workshop during one of the first three workshops in the residency and again during one of the final three workshops in the residency. The residencies all occurred during the spring of 1990. Some artists conducted more than one workshop during some weeks so that the total number of workshops exceeds the total number of weeks encompassed by the residency. In all, the following results are based on 12 hours of observation across workshops with first-, second-, and third-grade students participating in visual arts, music, and dance residencies, respectively.

First-Grade Visual Arts

These students were observed during three workshops with the artist, once directly and twice via videotape. The observations occured during the first, third, and third-from-the-last workshops in the residency series. From the beginning, these students were attentive and enthusiastic. The artist consistently reminded the students to stay seated, not talk while she or others were talking, and to raise their hands rather than call out in response to her questions or requests to volunteer.

By the third week, it was clear that students had learned the concepts taught in the previous workshops (e.g., shapes, color mixing) and were able to apply their knowledge to objects they had never seen before (e.g., a weaving, sculpture, flat line drawing, objects in the room). It was also clear that they retained previously taught skills (e.g., how to use the point of a brush). Levels of concentration were high during the independent work session which involved color mixing and painting. Students were patient with themselves and one another and took care with the materials and their work.

By the last observation, the extent to which students were able to draw upon previously taught knowledge and skills was clear. For example, they were 100% accurate in their identification and naming of complex shapes (e.g., cones) as they were embedded in unfamiliar objects.

Students spontaneously engaged in anticipatory behavior, an important element of problem solving ability. For example, they spontaneously suggested to the artist or to one another what would or should happen next during the course of an activity based on print and stencil making.

Calling out was non-existent and hand raising seemed a nearly spontaneous response to the artist's questions and requests. During this last observation, students were as enthusiastic and involved in the lesson as they had been during the first two observations. Those students who did not volunteer to participate during the first two observations did so during the final observation. In fact, every student volunteered to do something or respond during this observation.

Most notable was that, during the final observation, students spontaneously showed their work to the artist, their teacher, and one another and verbally praised their own work and that of others. During the first two observations, all such sharing and praise was initiated by the artist.

Second-Grade Music

These students were observed directly during three separate workshops held during the first, second, and ninth weeks of the 12-week residency. During all observations they were extremely attentive, involved, and active. The students' energy level was high and the artist and teacher were able to capitalize upon it by channeling it toward positive, creative production. Students quickly learned the concepts and skills presented by the artist, retained them across workshops, and were able to expand upon them and apply them in new situations. For example, in the first workshop, the artist introduced the concepts of beat and rhythm. The artist indicated that the students had learned in one lesson what he estimated would take three weeks. By the ninth-week observation, the students were able to use instruments to play separate parts simultaneously by reading rhythm patterns written on a chalkboard by the artist.

A major goal of this artist was that the students develop appreciation and appropriate application of the concepts ensemble ("team") and, at the same time, develop the skill of creative decision-making on an individual basis. By the ninth workshop, students definitely demonstrated the abilities to create music individually and together, i.e., in ensemble. Whether these dispositions toward cooperation and respect for others transferred to other situations is not so clear, especially since student discipline and classroom management appeared to be recurring issues with regard to these students.

Second- and Third-Grade Dance

These students were observed via videotape during a workshop occuring early in the residency and again during the next-to-last workshop. Two separate classes, quite different in character, were observed.

One class was attentive, obedient, polite, responsive, and generally subdued. They appeared to have a difficult time maintaining the pace set by the artist during the warm-up exercises of the first workshop and they exhibited poorly developed senses of rhythm. Their execution of the movements and steps demonstrated by the artist appeared accurate, but it also appeared that they were either uninvolved with the accompanying music or did not internalize its relationship to the dance.

By the next-to-last workshop, these students seemed more relaxed. For example, while waiting for the artist's direction, some students spontaneously engaged in rehearsing dance movements and the artist seemed to work harder for their attention than previously--perhaps because the students now seemed more involved with one another and the dance.

It was clear that students recognized concepts taught throughout the residency (e.g., particular steps and movements) and engaged in anticipatory and problem solving behaviors (e.g., unobtrusively dancing without a partner when the partner was absent). Evidence that these students had significantly improved their senses of rhythm was not apparent.

By comparison, the second class of dance residency students was boisterous. During the first observation of this class, 10 incidents of student interruption or misconduct which resulted in teacher or artist intervention were noted. By the last observation, the number of such interruptions was reduced by half.

From the beginning, the second class of students spontaneously rehearsed the movements presented by the artist and appeared to enjoy and be totally involved in the accompanying music. In short, their execution of the movements was not as accurate as that of the first group, but their apparent enjoyment of the activities was unmistakable. This enthusiasm appeared to maintain throughout the course of the residency. Although the dances observed during the early and later workshops differed, accuracy of movement appeared greater during the later workshop.

Individual Student Observations

Two sets of students were observed using preliminary and refined versions of the Shadowing Protocol included in Appendix A: a set of three special education students ranging in age from 13 to 16 years and a set of three second-grade children identified as having behavior problems. Each student within each set was observed two or three times over the course of the residencies in a variety of settings, e.g., during residency workshops and during classroom activities such as math lessons.

While the Shadowing Protocol in Appendix A was the product of a developmental activity associated with the MCED evaluation study, its potential for continuing development is worthy of mention, here. Essentially, the protocol was developed out of the desire to systematically and reliably obtain rich, qualitative data on children having special needs that cannot be adequately captured by more generally appropriate instruments such as questionnaires. Such students include special education students, students identified by their teachers as having behavior problems, etc.

Writing Analyses

Writing analyses were based on writing samples obtained from fourth- and fifth- grade students participating in a Writing/Drama residency through the process described in the Methods chapter of this report. Scoring procedures are detailed in the protocol supplied in Appendix A. Interrater reliability (i.e., the consistency between raters) was defined as the average correlation among ratings assigned by a number of raters (McNemar, 1969). In this study, the average correlations for ratings assigned by three raters correlations three raters ranged from .94 to .66 for item clusters and domains. Individual items were not as reliably scored, indicating that individual items should not be interpreted in isolation. Results of analyses based on writing samples from the first and ninth weeks of the residency are summarized in Table III- 16.

Insert Table III- 16 about here

These results show significant, positive changes on the receptive communication (understanding), tone (self-attitude), and fluency (confidence) items as well as for the self-attitudes domain consisting of items regarding tone, fluency, and pride-in-work.

Focus Group Interviews

Interviews were conducted with two groups of seventh-grade students in an intermmediate school (n=10 per group) and one group of ninth-, tenth-, and eleventh-grade high school students (n=8). Participants in each of these groups were selected because they had previously experienced multiple residencies or similar community-based, arts education programs. Hence, their responses were retrospective. Each interview lasted 45 minutes.

The procedures used to conduct the interviews are a modification of the procedures prescribed by Krueger (1986) and are detailed in Appendix A. Findings take the form of "impressions" which are overall conclusions based upon a synthesis of the groups' responses to particular items. The conclusions result from concensus between the interviewer and a "back-up" interviewer who independently synthesize the responses. Impressions are organized below according to the interview items addressed by the groups. The two junior high school groups are considered together.

Item #1

"It's possible to learn things from people who are not classroom teachers. Some of the things we learn from others are positive while others are not. We may learn facts or techniques or even attitudes or ways to think about things. What are some of the kinds of things you may have learned from the artists who have been in your classes?"

Overall, the seventh-graders said that they learned how to express themselves better. They learned to do this in writing and by acting out their feelings in front of others. They also reported learning that artists are "fun."

While the younger students' responses were predominately skills related, the high school students' responses focussed on affective outcomes. The older students said that they learned to value "openness" and how to be open by sharing things and ideas. They also learned about acceptance, i.e.,the valuing of others for what they are. This accepting attitude helped them work with others such as artists, and peers during the course of a production that involved all sorts of different people doing all sorts of different tasks such as lighting, acting, dancing, and stage design. Finally, they reported gaining a heightened awareness of the opportunities available to them. Some said that the experience had "expanded their horizons" in that they had not been exposed to the arts previously.

Item #2

"Usually when we learn something from someone, we begin to notice changes in how we think or feel or do things. What are some changes you may have noticed in yourselves or others--such as your teachers or friends--since working with the artists?"

The seventh-grade students said that they were more "open" and found it easier to express their feelings. They also observed their peers to be less shy in front of the class or others. These students reported no observed changes in their teachers who still "yelled." According to these students, teachers seem to yell because they are angry while artists, such as actors, seem to yell as a means of effectively expressing themsleves.

The high school students' responses centered on feelings of increased self-confidence. For example, they said that they felt their importance as individuals while also being team players in order to reach common goals within the context of a production. They reported that their "horizons expanded" by being around people who act for a living. They further felt that the chance to do anything is available to them. Finally, they reported that their feelings of confidence have generalized to the point that they are less nervous and more comfortable in front of others in a variety of situations.

Item #3

"How do you think these changes came about? For example, do you think that the changes that you've noticed in yourselves occured mostly because of (a) one particular artist that you met only once or (b) because of one artist that you met with for several weeks, or (c) because of your experiences with several different artists? Students, regardless of age, were unanimous in saying that the changes in themselves resulted from more than one exposure to more than one artist over time.

Item #4

Sometimes we feel or think or behave differently in different situations such as home and school or P.E. and math. What we would like to know about are some of the differences in how you felt or acted or thought obout things while working with an artist compared to your regular *classes? (Follow-up question: Do you have some ideas as to why?)."*

The younger students reported feeling more freedom in their interactions with the artists because the artists did not know the students' background and had no preconceived ideas about the students. These students also said that in working with the artists they were more relaxed; i.e., they felt able to make mistakes and learn from them whereas in their regular classes mistakes were equated with "wrong" answers and "bad grades." Students said that work with the artists is fun.

The older students also reported feeling freer with the artists, partly because the artists did not have the same expectations about their behaviors as their regular teachers. The students described their work with the artists in a production setting as being paced by themselves rather than by the clock. According to these students their other classes were predictable but with the artists there was the excitement of unpredictables.

Item #5

The Music Center believes that the artists can do a better job in the schools if the teachers and artists work together. What do you think? (Follow up with "Why?" and probe for what artists and teachers do when they "work together.").

Neither group of younger students remember their teachers and the artists as working together. They described their teachers as "just standing by and watching." Beyond that, the two seventh-grade groups responded somewhat differently.

One group expressed the concern that if teachers and artists worked together, students might be more afraid of "being busted". That is, the students tended to view the teachers as disciplinarians. The second group also viewed teachers as disciplinarians, but they saw this as important to the success of the residency because the teachers could enforce appropriate student behavior. This second group also thought that, since the artists had limited time to work with them, it was important for teachers to follow up on the artists lessons by allowing students to do more related or extended tasks.

The high school students said that either their teachers were interested and participated or they weren't and didn't. The students perceived that some of the uninvolved teachers were irritated by the students' participation. These students further described the teacher-artist partnership concept as important because "teachers are boring but they know how to teach" and "artists are free thinkers," implying that they are interesting but do not necessarily know how to teach. Students thought of this combination as complimentary.

Item #6

"Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your experiences with the artists before we go?"

The younger students did not respond to this question even with extensive probing. The high school students, however, offered the following:

- After the students finished working with the artists, they reported never seeing them again. They would like to have and they would like to have seen more of the artists own work.
- These students felt that in order for intensive exposures to the arts to work (e.g., long-term productions), participation should be voluntary. This sentiment did not seem to imply that students felt that their own participation had been forced. They, in fact, said that they would like to have had even more and different exposures to a wide variety of artists.
- Students reported very positive feelings toward their experiences particularly becuase of the social interactions it afforded and the interpersonal skills they developed. Students reported trying out for community choirs and productions that they would never have considered prior to their experiences with the MCED artists.

Teacher and Artist Logs

Forms (Appendix A) were distributed by the MCED representative attending the residency planning meetings for residencies beginning in the spring, 1990. The forms were referred to as logs and their purpose was to gather information about what teachers and artists did that illustrated the nature of their partnership. Completed logs (n=9) provide useful clues for future planning; despite the limited sample, the information was quite consistent across logs. In general, the logs support the findings yielded by the teacher and artist questionnaires regarding the Partnership Domain. The log data clearly suggest that most teacher-artist interactions were informal (i.e., before and after class, during breaks, in the halls, over lunch) and centered on how artists and teachers could integrate curricula and instructional efforts on particular topics (e.g., black history month), how teachers might expand on the activities initiated by the artists, and strategies for approaching learning, behavioral, or attitude difficulties of particular students or groups of students.

Overall, it appears that artists do most of the initial planning for the residency workshops and that teachers subsequently approach artists throughout the residency regarding particular ideas or problems. Artists seem particularly approachable and open to changing their original plans to accommodate the needs presented by the teachers and to providing follow up activities appropriate for classroom use.

Observations of Planning and Evaluation Meetings

Each residency begins with a planning meeting at the school site and ends with an evaluation meeting at the school site. The meetings are attended by an MCED staff member, the artist, participating teachers and the prinicipal and/or school-residency coordinator. Nine planning and seven evaluation meetings were also attended by members of the CSE team using the recording forms in Appendix A.

A critical review of the completed forms indicates that most meetings were short (seldom longer than 30 minutes), held before or after school hours and conducted by the MCED staff member. In the case of the planning meetings, it was typical that the artists pre-planned the residency workshops, school personnel provided feedback on the artists' plans, and when desirable, the artist modified his/her syllabus to meet the needs and wishes of the school.

In the case of the evaluation meetings, a list of questions, developed by MCED staff, were used to guide the discussion. A copy of these questions appear in Appendix E. Overall, the meetings consisted of teachers genuinely praising the artists work with the students and their sensitivity to the teachers' instructional needs and the schools' scheduling and space needs. Any critical aspects of the evaluation discussions tended to center on scheduling difficulties and the scarcity of time available for on-going planning and teacher-artist interaction.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions are organized around the questions addressed by the evaluation study. Recommendations are organized into three categories: those pertaining to the goals and content of the MCED program, those pertaining to future evaluation efforts, and those pertaining to program structure, management, and implementation issues.

The reader is reminded that all results should be interpreted in light of the wide variety of factors which impact life in schools and the effects of programs which are implemented in them. While great care has been taken to enhance the validity of the study through appropriate methodologies, results are, nonetheless, influenced by local school contexts, leadership, community characteristics, teacher characteristics, scheduling needs etc.--all of which are beyond the control of the MCED or our study of it. Our results thus reflect both the Artists-in-Residence program and its interaction with this diverse set of contextual variables.

Conclusions

Do Students Gain Cognitive Knowledge and Skills?

Questionnaire results and classroom observations of residency workshop sessions indicate that students learn, maintain, and generalize the factual knowledge and skills presented by the artists. In future evaluations, it would be useful to further assess transfer of knowledge and skills by observing a number of students, during their regular classroom and playground activities. The Shadowing Protocol (Appendix A) developed throughout the course of the MCED evaluation study should prove a useful tool for such purposes.

Report card grades based on classroom achievement also indicate that, overall, students gained in academic knowledge and skills from the period prior to their residency experiences to the period immediately following their residency experiences. While it may be confidently stated that improvement in grades occurred in conjunction with the residency experience, it may not be said that the residency experience caused such changes.

Do Students Gain Communication Skills?

The questionnaire and report card data show that students improved in both written and oral communication. While both self-report questionnaires and teacher-assigned grades are limited in reliability, conclusions based on these findings are additionally supported by classroom observations and focus group interview data. That is, observational data, particularly of the dance residency, show that reluctant students increased in spontaneity and students participating in the focus group interviews reported learning how to express themselves better in writing, by speaking in front of others, and by acting out their feelings.

Do Students Gain Higher Order Thinking Skills?

Questionnaire data indicate that students transfer or use the information and skills learned in the residency workshops to help them with their schoolwork and/or outside of school. Classroom observations provide evidence that students gained in problem solving behaviors such as anticipatory thinking. Observations of non-workshop classroom activities would be a useful addition to future evaluation efforts as would further development of the problem solving simulation procedure.

Are Attitudes and Affect Influenced Positively?

Questionnaire data were positive with regard to student attitudes such as motivation to participate in workshop activities, self-confidence, and enjoyment of workshop activities. Work habit/cooperation grades, overall, showed positive gains. The writing analyses, classroom observations, and focus group interview data are also suggestive of improved self-confidence in conjunction with artist exposure.

Attendance data indicated significant declines in attendance from the pre-residency to the during-residency periods, reflecting perhaps an increase in absences over the course of the school year. However, there were no significant differences in attendance between workshop and non-workshop days throughout the various residencies.

Do Students Gain in Socialization?

Work habit/cooperation grades, overall, showed significant improvement in all areas except works/plays well with others. While questionnaire data in the socialization domain were, overall, more positive than negative, compared to other domains of student outcomes, these data were also less positive regarding students' development of socially appropriate behaviors such as cooperation.

Teachers further volunteered that students became more aware of cultural diversities and gained in appreciation of their own heritages. For example, teachers said that students particularly appreciated it when the artist taught them a dance or rhythm from the country of their heritage. Direct evidence of such appreciation was observed by researchers involved in the MCED evaluation study in students' accurate and often joyful execution of culturally diverse dance movements, and uses of musical instruments native to other countries.

How is the Partnership Implemented and Perceived?

Based on questionnaire and log data; observations of planning meetings, evaluation meetings, and workshop sessions; focus group interview data; and Phase I interviews with principals and artists, the partnership aspect of the residency seems to be the weakest.

For example, the pre-planning is essentially done by the artists. The planning and evaluation meetings are too short for in-depth discussions, and they are usually held just before school when teachers are pressed to meet immediate instructional demands or directly after school when teachers are anxious to close out the day's activities, prepare for the next day, or depart for another commitment. These meetings often start late, making them even shorter than designed. Further, the meetings are usually led by MCED staff, which may seem necessary but which may also discourage school personnel from assuming more responsibility for the success of the residencies.

While nearly all teachers attend the workshops observations indicate that only a minority of them are active participants. Some use the time to grade papers or attend to other needs.

It appears that school personnel perceive the relationship to be a partnership because they pay for a portion of the services, most of them attend most of the required meetings, and the teachers and artists informally talk with one another about instructional issues. It also appears that the artists do not see this kind of relationship as a true partnership. Yet, they seem resigned to the current reality of a situation that makes meaningful, collaborative planning and follow-up time unlikely. For the most part, the artists appear dedicated to remaining flexible and doing whatever is necessary for the students to have positive arts experiences.

In sum, all stakeholders report that the partnership concept is important to the success of the program. However, there seem to be various conceptualizations of what constitutes a partnership and limits to what each group can contribute to such partnerships. At present, parents are not explicitly included.

What are the Strengths/Weaknesses of Program Content?

As indicated by citations in the annotated bibliography included in Appendix B, the MCED's program goals and content reflect high quality practice. While the idealism and comprehensiveness of these goals may increase the difficulty of valid program evaluation, it does not detract from the significance of the goals. Program content appears to be solid. The participating artists appear to be competent professionals who represent a wealth and variety of experiences and who generally were observed to exhibit sensitivity to the needs of students, educators, and the schooling process.

Recommendations

Recommendations are listed by categories. The three categories are (a) program goals and content, (b) Future evaluation efforts, and (c) program structure, management, and implementation.

Program Goals and Content

Goals

The goals of the program reflect high quality practice. The fact that their realization is difficult to evaluate does not make them less desirable. While current goals may be modified to reflect changing needs and practice, their core is solid and should be maintained.

Content

The practice of individual artists designing their own programs in accord with the needs of particular schools, classes, etc. is in keeping with good instructional practice. However, the MCED may contribute to program quality by providing procedural guidelines and criteria within which individual residencies must operate.

For example, if residencies are "tailored," then it seems reasonable to expect that each residency have a set of goals/objectives that are (a) articulated with the MCED's goals and (b) collaboratively developed among the artist, teachers, and school administrator prior to the development of the syllabus or lesson plans. The tailoring of residency objectives is not intended to interfere with the artist's sensitivity to the immediacy of each workshop; rather, such tailoring is intended to provide the kind of direction that facilitates the integration of the arts into the curriculum and enhances the school-artist partnership.

A second recommendation, with regard to program content, also centers on planning issues. Given that time constraints and various policies often interfere with the time available for quality planning, it is recommended that in-service, or similar, quality time be specifically devoted to meaningful, cooperative planning. The extent to which the artists would welcome extensive teacher input remains untested. While the concept of true partnership is theoretically sound, it may prove practically unfeasible.

Future Evaluation Efforts

It is recommended that future evaluations be patterned after the model that guided the present evaluation study such that (a) some assessment is summative in nature and used to demonstrate program accountability and (b) other information is formative in nature and used to inform program improvement. To illustrate the need for both kinds of assessment, consider that when popular indicators such as grades, attendance, and test scores are shown to improve in conjunction with instruction, evidence (not proof) of program accountability is provided. However, such evidence does not provide MCED staff with the kinds of information necessary for making decisions about how to more efficiently implement their programs or why certain students fail to make gains or what other kinds of gains students may be making.

Not every goal needs to be evaluated every year and not every participant needs to be assessed in order to draw conclusions. The first and most critical task is to decide what is important and feasible to assess and who should or can be assessed in order to best and efficiently answer the questions of concern. For some assessment questions, large data sets based on easily distributed and collected instruments such as questionnaires are most appropriate. For other questions, in-depth observation over time is required and, hence, can only reasonably be done on a case study basis using procedures such as systematic observation and interviews. The point is that in all cases, there should be an appropriate match between the assessment question and the choice of assessment methods; not all methods are appropriate to the assessment of all issues.

In those instances when grade, attendance, and questionnaire data are appropriate, the methods used for this study and as detailed in the Methods chapter and appendices should suffice. The questionnaires may be modified to increase clarity or meet changing needs and they may be extended downward to accommodate students in the primary grades.

While the problem solving simulation, writing analysis, and shadowing protocol are still in preliminary stages, they are far enough along in their development that they may be field tested, modified, and used on a formative basis. If they are used for accountability purposes, they will need to undergo reliability and validity studies. Such studies would involve empirical investigations of the extent to which various users are consistent with themselves and one another when applying the procedures as well as the documentation of the relationship between measures yielded by these procedures compared to those yielded by other procedures.

The focus group interview procedure is based in best practice and so long as the procedure is used as directed, the scripts may be modified to meet a variety of needs. For example, a focus group interview protocol could be developed around the questions that now guide the evaluation meetings. The interviews could be conducted on-site by non-MCED staff. Then, MCED staff could then conduct a focus group with the interviewers, thereby eliminating the need for MCED staff to travel to every evaluation meeting. School-Residency Coordinators might welcome the added responsibility, particularly if it brought a few perks such as released time to conduct the interviews and to attend and MCED interview/debriefing.

Instruments such as the teacher and artist logs and meeting observation forms may be used or modified insofar as they help meet a need. 'They might be used as models for developing other data collection formats. However, it is important for the MCED to remain sensitive to burden that data collection places on school personnel who already feel overwhelmed by paperwork, especially paperwork that seems unrelated to their instructional responsibilities and needs.

Program Structure, Management, and Implementation

The biggest problems, here, seemed to revolve around the efficient use of time and human resources, scheduling logistics, and timely communication between the schools and MCED staff whenever schools found it necessary to alter schedules. Such miscommunications result in unnecessary trips to schools, meeting absenteeism, etc. In addition to the suggestions included in the conclusions section of this chapter, the following recommendations are offered:

- The MCED staff do a commendable job of overseeing the residencies. However, they cannot be expected to continue their present level of on-site activity without sacrificing overall program quality. One way to deal with the situation may be to delegate more oversight responsibility to school-based personnel by training them to carry out responsibilities such as conducting the planning and evaluating meetings, recording the culminating events, distributing questionnaires, etc. This training and transfer of responsibility may occur on a developmental basis. For example, during the first year that a school participates in the Program, MCED staff may assume most of the associated responsibilities; whereas, by the third year of participation, direct MCED staff involvement may be minimal. Since principal cooperation and involvement is critical to the success of these kinds of efforts, the MCED may consider making principal involvement in the training a requirement for program participation.

- Limiting participation in the residencies to volunteer teachers may enhance the partnership aspect of the residency program. The trade-off, however, may be that the students the MCED most wants to reach may be denied exposure.
- At the evaluation meetings, teachers and artists might find it useful to submit ideas for follow-up that they have successfully tried or would like to try. These could be compiled and distributed to other teachers and artists.

In sum, results of this evaluation study must be interpreted cautiously since it was conducted in regular school sites where true experimental designs were not feasible. It is the opinion of the evaluators that the MCED's Artists-in-Residence Program exceeds expectations for meeting its goals.

Table II-1

Data Sources by Domain

Key: Phase I = 10/89-12/89
Phase II = 12/89- 6/90
Phase III = 1/90- 7/90
Phase IV = 8/90- 9/90

Domain	Instrument/Procedure	Availability	Scope
Cognitive	Classroom grades	School records	Selected residencies with school's permission
	Questionnaires: Teacher & School Administrator	Modify MCED questionnaires	Invite participation of all residencies ending in May or June, 1990
	Questionnaires: Student, Artist	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Invite participation of all residencies ending in May or June, 1990
	Questionnaires: Parent	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Trial basis for future development
	Classroom Observations	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Videotape Analyses	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Trial basis for future development

Domain	Instrument/Procedure	Availability	Scope
Communication	Writing Analyses	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Classroom Observations	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Questionnaires (student, teacher, etc.)	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Invite participation of all residencies ending in May or June, 1990
	Videotape Analyses	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Trial basis for future development
Higher Order Thinking	Problem Solving Simulations	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Trial basis for future development
	Questionnaires (student, teacher, etc.)	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Invite participation of all residencies ending in May or June, 1990
	Classroom Observations	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Videotape Analyses	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Trial basis for future development

TABLE II-1 continued

Domain	Instrument/Procedure	Availability	Scope
Attitudes & Affects	Questionnaires (student, teacher, etc.	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Invite participation of all residencies ending in May or June, 1990
	Attendance	School Records	Selected residencies with school's permission
	Classroom Observations	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Writing Analyses	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Focus Group Interviews	Students having multiple program exposures	Case Study
Socialization	Classroom Observations	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Writing Analyses	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Case Study
	Questionnaires (student, teacher, etc.)	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Invite participation of all residencies ending in May or June, 1990

Domain	Instrument/Procedure	Availability	Scope
Partnership	Teacher and Artist logs	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Invite participation of all teachers and artists involved in a residency scheduled between 2/90 and 6/90
	Observations of Residency planning and Evaluation meetings	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Representative sample of residencies
	Questionnaires (student, teacher, etc.)	To be developed in Phase II for use in Phase III	Invite participation of all residencies ending in May or June, 1990
	Focus Group interviews	Students having multiple program exposures	Case Study

Table II-2

Data Collection by Residency Type

	Residency Type		
Data Collection Instrument/Procedure	Discipline	Grade Levels	School Ethnicity
Assessment of needs for designing the study	Writing	4,5	84% Blk, 7% Cauc, 6% Hisp, 3% Other
	Visual Arts	6-8	65% Cauc, 20% Hisp, 11% Blk, 4% Asian
	Dance	2	71% Hisp, 13% Asian 11% Cauc, 5% Other
	Drama	7,8	80% Hisp, 15% Cauc, 5% Asian
	Drama	K	70% Blk, 30% Hisp
Writing Analyses	Writing/Drama	4,5	71% Hisp, 13% Asian, 11% Cauc, 5% Other

TABLE II-2 continued

Data Collection Instrument/Procedure	Residency Type		
	Discipline	Grade Levels	School Ethnicity
Classroom Observations	Visual Arts	Spec Ed (ages 13-16)	N/A
	Music	2	70% Blk, 30% Hisp
	Dance	4	38% Asian, 32% Hisp, 20% Cauc, 6% Blk, 4% Other
Videotape Analyses	Dance	3	71% Hisp, 13% Asian, 11% Cauc, 5% Other
	Visual Arts	1	70% Blk, 30% Hisp
Problem Solving Trial	Drama	Spec Ed (grades 1-3)	63% Blk, 36% Cauc, 1% Other
Focus Group Interviews	Various*	7-12	80% Hisp, 15% Cauc, 5% Asian

---

* Involved students who had experienced multiple residencies or similar programs

Data Collection Instrument/Procedure	Residency Type		
	Discipline*	Grade Levels	School Ethnicity
Observations of Orientation, Planning, Evaluation Meetings	Dance Writing/Drama	4 4,5	71% Hisp, 13% Asian 11% Cauc, 5% Other
	Visual Arts Music	1 2	70% Blk, 30% Hisp,
	Drama	Spec Ed & 1-3	63% Blk, 36% Hips, 1% Other
	Drama	2	75% Blk, 25% Hisp
	Dance	4	38% Asian, 32% Hisp, 20% Cauc, 6% Blk, 1% Other
	Visual Arts	Spec Ed	N/A
	Writing/Drama	K-5	64% Cauc, 21% Hisp, 8% Blk, 5% Asian, 2% Other

---

* Grouped by school (e.g., the Dance & Writing Residencies grouped together here, occurred at the same school).

TABLE II-2 continued

Data Collection Instrument/Procedure	Residency Type		
	Discipline*	Grade Levels	School Ethnicity
Classroom Grades and Attendance Data	Dance	4 (3 classes)	38% Asian, 32% Hisp, 20% Cauc, 6% Blk, 4% Other
	Writing/Drama	1 (1 class) 2 (2 classes) 5 (1 class)	64% Cauc, 21% Hisp, 8% Blk, 5% Asian, 2% Other
	Visual Arts	Spec Ed. (1 class; 13-16 year olds)	N/A
	Dance Writing/Drama	2, (1/2 class), 3, (3 1/2 classes), 4, (3 1/2 classes), 5, (1/2 class)	71% Hisp, 13% Asian 11% Cauc, 5% Other
	Drama	2 (4 classes)	75% Blk, 25% Hisp
	Visual Arts Drama Music	1, (4 classes) 3, (1/2 class) 4, (3 1/2 classes) 2, (3 classes)	70% Blk, 30% Hisp

---

* Grouped by School

Table II-3

Data Collection Procedures by Phase III Research Question

Question	Procedures
#1 (Cognitive Knowledge & Skills)	•questionnaires •writing analyses •observations* •subject matter grades
#2 (Communication)	•questionnaires •observations •writing analyses
#3 (Higher Order Thinking)	•questionnaires •observations •writing analyses
#4 (Attitudes and Affects)	•questionnaires •observations •writing analyses •attendance data •effort grades •focus group interviews

---

*Observations include videotape analyses & shadowing procedures

Question	Procedures
#5 (Socialization)	•questionnaires •observations* •writing analyses
#6 (Partnership)	•questionnaires •focus group interviews •teacher and artist logs •meeting observations
#7 (Program Strengths & Weaknesses)	•questionnaires •phase I interviews with program participants (e.g., artists, school personnel) •meeting observations •focus group interviews •teacher and artist logs •experience with the process of conducting the study

---

*Observations include videotape analyses & shadowing procedures

Table II-4

Data Source	Analysis Procedure(s)
Questionnaires	• Frequency distribution for each item (i.e., numerical distribution of responses) • Descriptive statistics for each item
Classroom subject matter and effort grades	• Descriptive statistics for each subject matter & effort grade (e.g., mathematics, social studies) • Statistical, Pre-Post Residency comparisons for each subject matter & effort grade
Attendance data	• Statistical comparison for residency days vs. non-residency days • Statistical comparisons for residency duration (i.e., 8-16 weeks) vs. non-residency periods before/after the residency
Observations, including shadowing and Videotapes	• Descriptive findings based on systematic observations over time
Writing Portfolios	• Statistical comparisons of scores yielded by writing samples produced relatively early & late in the residency
Focus Group Interviews	• Synthesis using modified procedures designed by Krueger
Teacher and Artist Logs, Meeting Observations, Problem Solving Simulation	• Critical analysis to inform future planning & development efforts

Table III-1

Student Survey Responses: Number of valid student responses per item; item means; item standard deviations; number of responses, by item, per response category; and percent of responses, by item, per response category

KEY: N=Number of student responses used to calculate M, S, & %.
M=Mean of all valid students' responses to the item
S=standard Deviation of valid students' responses to the item
(i.e., average amount students' responses differ from the mean)
4.00=Strongly agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly Disagree
n=Number of students selecting the response to the item
%=Percent of students selecting the response to the item

NOTE: Item numbers refer to the sequencing of items on the Student Questionnaire. In the Table below, items are grouped by Domain.

Domain: Cognitive Knowledge and Skills

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories			
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
2	I have learned a lot from working with the artist	503	3.43	.72	n:	272	187	32	12
					%	54.10	37.20	6.4	2.4

TABLE III-1 continued

Domain: Higher Order Thinking

						Response Categories			
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
3	I use what I learned from the artist to help me with my other schoolwork	502	2.66	.92	n:	98	192	15	59
					%:	19.5	38.2	30.5	11.8
4	I use what I learned from the artist to help me do things outside of school	498	2.93	.98	n:	171	172	105	50
					%	34.3	34.5	21.1	10.0

Domain: Affects and Attitudes

						Response Categories			
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
5	The artist helped me feel like I can do anything if I try	503	3.44	.83	n:	305	137	36	25
					%:	60.6	27.2	7.2	5.0
7	I have always wanted to be an artist	494	2.64	1.11	n:	150	116	130	98
					%:	30.4	23.5	26.3	19.8
8	I am thinking about becoming an artist	494	2.49	1.08	n:	112	131	139	112
					%	22.7	26.5	28.1	22.7
9	I wish we had more time to work with the artist	499	3.51	.81	n:	331	115	29	24
					%	66.3	23.0	5.8	4.8
10	I would like to work with other artists	499	2.92	1.05	n:	179	177	65	78
					%	35.9	35.5	13.0	15.6

TABLE III-1 continued

						Response Categories			
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
16	I actively participated in the culminating event	477	3.42	.88	n:	296	116	34	31
					%	62.1	24.3	7.1	6.5
17	I enjoyed getting ready for the culminating event	468	3.33	.88	n:	252	146	40	30
					%:	53.8	31.2	8.5	6.4
18	I felt that I could be successful with the activities we did with the Artist	490	3.28	.85	n:	237	182	43	28
					%:	48.4	37.1	8.8	5.7
20	Since working with the Artist, I have read books about the kinds of things the Artist taught us	492	2.11	.97	n:	54	99	187	152
					%:	11.0	20.1	38.0	30.9
21	Since working with the Artist, I have asked my teacher for more information about the arts	490	2.11	.95	n:	48	109	184	149
					%:	9.8	22.2	37.6	30.4
25	I felt proud of myself when I participated in the classes taught by the Artist	498	3.36	.84	n:	273	153	48	24
					%:	54.8	30.7	9.6	4.8

TABLE III-1 continued

						Response Categories			
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
26	I tried hard to do a good job on the activities we did with the Artist	491	3.55	.71	n:	320	138	18	15
					%	65.2	28.1	3.7	3.1
27	Since working with the Artist, I try harder in school	488	2.84	.93	n:	128	208	100	52
					%:	26.2	42.6	20.5	10.7

Domain: Teacher-Artist Partnership

						Response Categories			
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
11	My teacher participated when the artist worked with our class	502	3.08	.99	n:	214	166	68	54
					%	42.6	33.1	13.5	10.8
12	My teacher and the artist worked together to get ready for the artist's workshops with the class	493	2.98	1.03	n:	192	164	72	65
					%	38.9	33.3	14.6	13.2
13	In our regular class work, my teacher uses examples from our workshops with the artist	495	2.86	.96	n:	140	199	101	55
					%	28.3	40.2	20.4	11.1

TABLE III-1 continued

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories			
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
14	My teacher makes assignments that are related to what we learned from the artist	495	2.73	.98	n:	122	183	123	67
					%:	24.6	37.0	24.8	13.5
15	The artist talks about things that are going on in my regular classroom	499	2.50	.95	n:	78	176	162	83
					%:	15.6	35.3	32.5	16.6

Domain: Communication

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories			
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
6	I talk with my parents about the artist	500	2.98	.90	n:	155	220	84	41
					%	31.0	44.0	16.8	8.2
19	I asked the artist a lot of questions	495	2.52	.96	n:	88	159	172	76
					%	17.4	31.4	34.0	15.0
22	Since working with Artist, I participate more in class	491	2.76	.99	n:	130	178	118	65
					%	26.5	36.3	24.0	13.2
28	I understood what the artist expected of me	496	3.40	.77	n:	266	183	27	20
					%	53.6	36.9	5.4	4.0

TABLE III-1 continued

Domain: Socialization

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories 4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
23	Since working with the Artist, I get along better with the other students	493	2.76	.97	n: %	125 25.4	187 37.9	118 23.9	63 12.8
24	Since working with the Artist, I help other students more	490	2.51	.94	n: %	78 15.9	172 35.1	164 33.5	76 15.5

Table III-2

Student Survey: Item Means by School

Key: School A (Elem: 84% Blk., 7% Cauc., 6% Hisp., 3% other)
B (Elem: 67% Hisp., 21% Cauc., 8% Blk., 4% other)
C (Elem: 40% Blk., 28% Cauc., 17% Hisp., 11% Asian, 1% other)
D (JHS: Special Ed)
E (Elem: 80% Hisp., 10% Cauc., 5% Blk., 5% Asian)
F (Elem: 47% Cauc., 18% Asian, 15% Blk., 15% Hisp., 5% other)
G (Intermed: 95% Hisp., 4% Cauc.)
H (Elem: 70% Blk., 30% Hisp.)

4.00=Strongly Agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly Disagree

M=mean
n=number of responses used to calculate the mean
N/A=Not Available (no valid response)

			School							
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	I enjoyed working with the artist	M:	3.34	3.75	3.54	4.00	3.85	3.29	3.95	3.82
		n:	61	122	28	6	20	123	103	39
2	I have learned a lot from working with the artist	M:	3.17	3.61	3.21	3.17	3.50	3.20	3.62	3.72
		n:	60	122	28	6	20	123	103	39
3	I use what I learned from the artist to help me with my other school work.	M:	2.28	2.45	2.54	3.50	3.05	2.67	3.00	2.73
		n:	61	122	28	6	20	121	102	40
4	I use what I learned from the artist to help me do things outside of school.	M:	2.43	3.10	2.54	N/A	3.25	2.76	3.23	3.10
		n:	61	122	28	N/A	20	123	102	40

TABLE III-2 continued

			School							
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
5	The artist helped me feel like I can do anything if I try.	M:	2.93	3.62	3.32	3.00	3.75	3.15	3.76	3.68
		n:	60	122	28	6	20	123	102	40
6	I talk with my parents about the artist.	M:	2.72	3.00	3.00	3.33	3.25	2.71	3.33	3.08
		n:	61	121	28	3	20	123	102	40
7	I have always wanted to be an artist.	M:	2.38	2.45	2.07	N/A	3.00	2.67	3.03	2.79
		n:	60	121	28	N/A	20	122	103	39
8	I am thinking about becoming an artist.	M:	2.24	2.44	2.21	4.00	2.45	2.41	2.81	2.64
		n:	59	122	28	1	20	120	103	39
9	I wish we had more time to work with the artist.	M:	3.28	3.75	3.43	3.60	3.60	3.05	3.89	3.61
		n:	60	122	28	5	20	121	103	38
10	I would like to work with other artists.	M:	3.11	2.36	3.07	2.75	2.32	3.00	3.39	3.03
		n:	61	122	28	4	19	121	103	39
11	My teacher participated when the artist worked with our class.	M:	2.93	2.97	2.71	3.50	3.40	2.65	3.81	2.41
		n:	61	121	28	6	20	123	102	39
12	My teacher and the artist worked together to get ready for the artist's workshop with the class.	M:	3.12	2.57	2.86	N/A	3.65	2.60	3.64	3.28
		n:	61	121	28	N/A	20	121	102	39
13	In our regular class work, my teacher uses examples from our workshops with the artist.	M:	2.77	2.57	2.68	N/A	3.20	2.69	3.51	2.67
		n:	61	122	28	N/A	20	121	103	39

			School							
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
14	My teacher makes assignments that are related to what we learned from the artist.	M:	2.66	2.61	2.71	N/A	2.40	2.66	3.22	2.29
		n:	61	122	28	N/A	20	122	103	38
15	The artist talks about things that are going on in my regular classroom.	M:	2.43	2.54	2.23	3.50	2.90	2.38	2.60	2.41
		n:	60	122	26	6	20	122	103	39
16	I actively participated in the culminating event.	M:	3.31	3.17	3.07	N/A	3.20	3.49	3.65	3.80
		n:	61	106	28	N/A	20	120	102	39
17	I enjoyed getting ready for the culminating event.	M:	3.16	3.30	3.08	N/A	2.80	3.16	3.68	3.63
		n:	61	102	26	N/A	20	119	101	38
18	I felt that I could be successful with the activities we did with the artist.	M:	2.85	3.43	3.11	N/A	3.47	3.03	3.54	3.60
		n:	61	122	27	N/A	19	120	103	37
19	I asked the artist a lot of questions.	M:	2.54	2.52	2.59	3.17	2.80	2.23	2.78	2.44
		n:	59	122	27	6	20	119	102	39
20	Since working with the artist, I have read books about the kinds of things the artist taught us.	M:	1.72	1.96	1.84	N/A	1.85	2.09	2.57	2.36
		n:	61	122	25	N/A	20	121	103	39
21	Since working with the artist, I have asked my teacher for more information about the arts.	M:	1.84	2.26	1.76	N/A	2.10	1.75	2.65	2.05
		n:	61	120	25	N/A	20	122	103	38

TABLE III-2 continued

			School							
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
22	Since working with the artist, I participate more in class.	M:	2.41	2.78	2.42	N/A	3.00	2.65	3.07	2.89
		n:	61	122	26	N/A	20	121	103	37
23	Since working with the artist, I get along better with other students.	M:	2.30	2.92	2.74	N/A	3.15	2.58	2.93	2.92
		n:	61	122	27	N/A	20	122	103	37
24	Since working with the artist, I help other students more.	M:	2.30	2.54	2.50	N/A	2.45	2.38	2.73	2.72
		n:	61	121	26	N/A	20	122	103	36
25	I felt proud of myself when I participated in the classes taught by the artist.	M:	3.10	3.53	3.56	3.83	3.70	2.95	3.56	3.51
		n:	61	122	27	6	20	121	103	37
26	I tried hard to do a good job on the activities we did with the artist.	M:	3.30	3.64	3.46	3.80	3.65	3.26	3.84	3.83
		n:	60	122	26	5	20	120	101	36
27	Since working with the artist, I try harder in school.	M:	2.57	2.90	2.54	N/A	3.25	2.61	3.11	3.14
		n:	60	122	26	N/A	20	121	102	36
28	I understood what the artist expected of me.	M:	3.30	3.50	3.59	3.50	3.60	3.11	3.58	3.44
		n:	61	121	27	6	20	121	103	36

Table III-3

Student Survey: Item Means by Grade Level

Key: 4.00=Strongly Agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly Disagree

M=mean
n=number of responses used to calculate the mean
N/A=Not Available (no valid response)

			Grade Level*					
			4	5	6	7	9	Other
1	I enjoyed working with the artist	M:	3.58	3.78	3.40	4.00	4.00	3.57
		n:	65	264	161	4	1	7
2	I have learned a lot from working with the artist	M:	3.58	3.55	3.21	2.75	3.00	3.00
		n:	65	264	160	4	1	7
3	I use what I learned from the artist to help me with my other school work.	M:	2.77	2.81	2.48	3.25	4.00	2.43
		n:	65	263	160	4	1	7
4	I use what I learned from the artist to help me do things outside of school.	M:	2.98	3.05	2.72	N/A	N/A	2.50
		n:	65	264	161	0	0	6

---

*There were no grade 8 respondents; grade 7, 9, and "other" respondents were primarily Special Education Students.

TABLE III-3 continued

			Grade Level					
			4	5	6	7	9	Other
5	The artist helped me feel like I can do anything if I try.	M:	2.83	3.53	3.24	3.00	3.00	3.43
		n:	65	264	160	4	1	7
6	I talk with my parents about the artist.	M:	3.09	3.09	2.74	3.00	4.00	3.00
		n:	65	264	160	2	1	6
7	I have always wanted to be an artist.	M:	2.98	2.70	2.41	N/A	N/A	2.67
		n:	64	264	159	0	0	6
8	I am thinking about becoming an artist.	M:	2.66	2.61	2.24	4.00	N/A	1.67
		n:	65	264	156	1	0	6
9	I wish we had more time to work with the artist.	M:	3.32	3.68	3.31	4.00	3.00	3.43
		n:	65	263	158	3	1	7
10	I would like to work with other artists.	M:	2.58	2.98	2.96	2.50	3.00	2.57
		n:	65	263	159	2	1	7
11	My teacher participated when the artist worked with our class.	M:	3.05	3.32	2.69	3.75	4.00	3.00
		n:	65	262	161	4	1	7
12	My teacher and the artist worked together to get ready for the artist's workshop with the class.	M:	1.98	3.29	2.87	N/A	N/A	3.17
		n:	64	263	159	0	0	6
13	In our regular class work, my teacher uses examples from our workshops with the artist.	M:	2.85	2.96	2.69	N/A	N/A	3.00
		n:	65	264	159	0	0	6

TABLE III-3 continued

			Grade Level					
			4	5	6	7	9	Other
14	My teacher makes assignments that are related to what we learned from the artist.	M:	2.72	2.83	2.60	N/A	N/A	1.83
		n:	65	263	160	0	0	6
15	The artist talks about things that are going on in my regular classroom.	M:	2.05	2.52	2.62	3.75	3.00	2.29
		n:	65	261	160	4	1	7
16	I actively participated in the culminating event.	M:	3.70	3.47	3.24	N/A	N/A	2.33
		n:	64	262	144	0	0	6
17	I enjoyed getting ready for the culminating event.	M:	3.37	3.44	3.15	N/A	N/A	2.00
		n:	63	254	144	0	0	6
18	I felt that I could be successful with the activities we did with the artist.	M:	3.29	3.42	3.04	N/A	N/A	3.50
		n:	65	260	158	0	0	6
19	I asked the artist a lot of questions.	M:	2.16	2.61	2.50	3.25	3.00	2.43
		n:	63	262	157	4	1	7
20	Since working with the artist, I have read books about the kinds of things the artist taught us.	M:	2.08	2.22	1.96	N/A	N/A	1.83
		n:	64	35	159	0	0	6
21	Since working with the artist, I have asked my teacher for more information about the arts.	M:	1.94	2.27	1.96	N/A	N/A	1.50
		n:	65	261	157	0	0	6

TABLE III-3 continued

			Grade Level					
			4	5	6	7	9	Other
22	Since working with the artist, I participate more in class.	M:	2.86	2.85	2.58	N/A	N/A	2.50
		n:	64	260	160	0	0	6
23	Since working with the artist, I get along better with other students.	M:	2.95	2.76	2.68	N/A	N/A	3.00
		n:	65	261	160	0	0	6
24	Since working with the artist, I help other students more.	M:	2.69	2.51	2.46	N/A	N/A	2.33
		n:	65	259	159	0	0	6
25	I felt proud of myself when I participated in the classes taught by the artist.	M:	3.31	3.48	3.16	4.00	3.00	3.29
		n:	64	261	160	4	1	7
26	I tried hard to do a good job on the activities we did with the artist.	M:	3.42	3.70	3.38	4.00	3.00	3.29
		n:	65	257	157	3	1	7
27	Since working with the artist, I try harder in school.	M:	2.98	2.93	2.65	N/A	N/A	3.00
		n:	64	258	159	0	0	6
28	I understood what the artist expected of me.	M:	3.50	3.45	3.28	3.75	3.00	3.14
		n:	64	260	159	4	1	7

Table III-4

Student Survey: Item Means by Type of Residency

Key: 4.00=Strongly Agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly Disagree

M=mean
n=number of responses used to calculate the mean

			Type of Residency			
			Dance	Drama	Visual Arts	Writing/Drama
1	I enjoyed working with the artist	M:	3.77	3.37	3.87	3.34
		n:	161	143	137	61
2	I have learned a lot from working with the artist	M:	3.64	3.24	3.50	3.17
		n:	161	143	137	60
3	I use what I learned from the artist to help me with my other school work.	M:	2.52	2.72	2.93	2.28
		n:	162	141	136	61
4	I use what I learned from the artist to help me do things outside of school.	M:	3.10	2.83	3.08	2.43
		n:	162	143	130	61

TABLE III-4 continued

			Type of Residency			
			Dance	Drama	Visual Arts	Writing/Drama
5	The artist helped me feel like I can do anything if I try.	M:	3.64	3.23	3.40	2.93
		n:	162	143	136	60
6	I talk with my parents about the artist.	M:	3.02	2.78	3.26	2.72
		n:	161	143	133	61
7	I have always wanted to be an artist.	M:	2.53	2.72	2.82	2.38
		n:	160	142	131	60
8	I am thinking about becoming an artist.	M:	2.67	2.41	2.69	2.24
		n:	161	140	132	59
9	I wish we had more time to work with the artist.	M:	3.71	3.13	3.77	3.28
		n:	160	141	136	60
10	I would like to work with other artists.	M:	2.52	2.91	3.30	3.11
		n:	161	140	135	61
11	My teacher participated when the artist worked with our class.	M:	3.00	2.76	3.57	2.93
		n:	160	143	136	61
12	My teacher and the artist worked together to get ready for the artist's workshop with the class.	M:	2.74	2.74	3.47	3.11
		n:	160	141	130	61
13	In our regular class work, my teacher uses examples from our workshops with the artist.	M:	2.59	2.77	3.33	2.77
		n:	161	141	131	61

TABLE III-4 continued

			Type of Residency			
			Dance	Drama	Visual Arts	Writing/Drama
14	My teacher makes assignments that are related to what we learned from the artist.	M:	2.53	2.63	3.11	2.66
		n:	160	142	131	61
15	The artist talks about things that are going on in my regular classroom.	M:	2.51	2.45	2.57	2.43
		n:	161	142	135	60
16	I actively participated in the culminating event.	M:	3.38	3.45	3.52	3.31
		n:	145	140	130	61
17	I enjoyed getting ready for the culminating event.	M:	3.39	3.11	3.56	3.16
		n:	140	139	127	61
18	I felt that I could be successful with the activities we did with the artist.	M:	3.47	3.09	3.45	2.85
		n:	159	139	130	61
19	I asked the artist a lot of questions.	M:	2.50	2.31	2.76	2.54
		n:	161	139	135	59
20	Since working with the artist, I have read books about the kinds of things the artist taught us.	M:	2.06	2.06	2.43	1.72
		n:	161	141	128	61
21	Since working with the artist, I have asked my teacher for more information about the arts.	M:	2.21	1.57	2.48	1.84
		n:	158	142	128	61

TABLE III-4 continued

			Type of Residency			
			Dance	Drama	Visual Arts	Writing/Drama
22	Since working with the artist, I participate more in class.	M:	2.81	2.70	2.94	2.41
		n:	159	141	129	61
23	Since working with the artist, I get along better with other students.	M:	2.92	2.66	2.89	2.30
		n:	159	142	130	61
24	Since working with the artist, I help other students more.	M:	2.58	2.39	2.68	2.30
		n:	157	142	129	61
25	I felt proud of myself when I participated in the classes taught by the artist.	M:	3.53	3.06	3.57	3.10
		n:	159	141	136	61
26	I tried hard to do a good job on the activities we did with the artist.	M:	3.68	3.31	3.77	3.30
		n:	158	140	132	60
27	Since working with the artist, I try harder in school.	M:	2.96	2.70	2.99	2.57
		n:	158	141	128	60
28	I understood what the artist expected of me.	M:	3.48	3.18	3.58	3.30
		n:	157	141	136	61

Table III-5

Teacher Survey Responses: Number of teachers responding to each item; item means; item standard deviations; number of responses, by item, per response category; and percent of responses, by item, per response category.

KEY: N=number of teachers responses used to calculate M, S, & %
M=mean of all valid teachers' responses to the item
S=Standard Deviation of valid teachers' responses to the item
(i.e., average amount teachers' responses differ from the mean)
n=the number of teachers selecting the response to the item
%=percent of teachers selecting the response to the item

4.00=All
3.00=Most
2.00=Few
1.00=None

NOTE: Item numbers refer to the sequencing items on the Teacher Questionnaire.
In the Table below, items are grouped below by Domain.

Domain: Teacher-Artist Partnership

						Response Categories			
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
8	During this residency, I was present at ___ of my students' workshops	54	3.65	.52	n:	36	17	1	0
					%:	66.7	31.5	1.9	0
9	During this residency, I actively participated in ___ of the student workshops	53	2.94	1.03	n:	17	22	11	3
					%:	32.1	41.5	20.8	5.7

TABLE III-5 continued

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories			
						1.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
10	During this residency, the artist and I collaborated on ___ of the student workshops	53	2.57	1.17	n: %:	11 20.8	20 37.7	16 30.2	6 11.3

Key: 4.00=Strongly Agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly Disagree
N/A=Does not apply, e.g., not scheduled, no opportunity to observe, etc.

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
18	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers andartists collaborate.	54	3.50	.61	n: %:	30 55.6	21 38.9	3 5.67	0 0	0 0
20	I actively participated in the Planning/Orientation meeting(s).	52	3.29	.72	n: %:	22 42.3	24 46.2	5 9.6	1 1.9	2
21	I actively participated in the Special Events (e.g., Teacher workshops, Field Trips).	33	3.24	.71	n: %:	13 39.4	15 45.5	5 15.2	0	19
22	I actively participated in the Final Evaluation meeting.	54	3.56	.57	n: %:	32 59.3	20 37.0	2 3.7	0	0

Domain: Cognitive Knowledge and Skills

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
11	My students learned the skills and cognitive knowledge taught by this artist	53	3.55	50	n:	29	24	0	0	2
					%:	54.7	45.3			
36	My students accurately executed workshop tasks and activities.	53	3.32	.55	n:	19	32	2	0	2
					%:	35.8	60.4	3.8		

Domain: Higher Order Thinking

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
12	The knowledge and skills my students learned from this artist carried over into their regular classwork.	54	3.55	.50	n:	15	37	2	0	0
					%:	27.8	68.5	3.7		

TABLE III-5 continued

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
37	My students shared outside-of-school experiences with me that were related to the Residency.	42	2.69	.90	n:	7	20	10	5	11
					%:	16.7	47.6	23.8	11.9	
38	Since working with the artist, my students more accurately follow instructions.	45	2.56	.62	n:	2	22	20	1	7
					%:	4.4	48.9	44.4	2.2	

Domain: Affects and Attitudes

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
13	My students increased their appreciation of the arts from working with this artist.	54	3.57	.54	n:	32	21	1	0	0
					%:	59.3	38.9	1.9		
14	My students gained more positive attitudes about themselves from working with this artist.	54	3.56	.50	n:	30	24	0	0	0
					%:	55.6	44.4			

TABLE III-5 continued

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
15	My students gained more positive attitudes about school from working with this artist.	53	3.28	.60	n: %:	19 35.8	30 56.6	4 7.5	0	2
16	My students' behavior has improved as a result of working with this artist.	50	2.62	.75	n: %:	6 12.0	21 42.0	21 42.0	2 4.0	3
17	My students enjoyed working with this artist.	55	3.84	.37	n: %:	46 83.6	9 16.4	0	0	0
41	Since working with the artist, my students are more cooperative in the classroom (e.g., get along better with their peers).	46	2.61	.80	n: %:	6 13.0	19 41.3	18 39.1	3 6.5	7
42	Since working with the artist, my students are more cooperative outside of class (e.g., on the playground).	45	2.53	.87	n: %:	7 15.6	14 31.1	20 44.4	4 8.9	8

Domain: Communication

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories 4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
39	Since working with the artist, my students participate more in class.	49	2.78	.72	n:	7	25	16	1	3
					%:	14.3	51.0	32.7	2.0	
40	Since working with the artist, my students are more willing to express themselves (orally and written).	52	3.00	.74	n:	13	27	11	1	0
					%:	25.0	51.9	21.2	1.9	

Domain: Other (Program Management and Implementation

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories 4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
19	Our School-Residency Coordinator provided me with schedules and materials throughout the residency.	52	3.39	.72	n:	26	21	4	1	2
					%:	50.0	40.4	7.7	1.9	
23	The Orientation/ Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the artist.	46	3.41	.65	n:	23	19	4	0	6
					%:	50.0	41.3	8.7		
24	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was useful to me.	50	3.28	.70	n:	21	22	7	0	4
					%:	42.0	44.0	14.0		

TABLE III-5 continued

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
25	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s)	49	3.00	.79	n:	13	25	9	2	2
					%:	26.5	51.0	18.4	4.1	
26	The Orientation/ Planning meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency.	48	3.21	.68	n:	16	27	4	1	4
					%:	33.3	56.3	8.3	2.1	
27	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the artist.	48	3.48	.51	n:	23	25	0	0	1
					%:	47.9	52.1			
28	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me.	49	3.31	.74	n:	21	24	2	2	1
					%:	42.9	49.0	4.1	4.1	
29	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting.	51	3.28	.67	n:	20	25	6	0	1
					%:	39.2	49.0	11.8		
30	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies.	50	3.38	.57	n:	21	27	2	0	0
					%:	42.0	54.0	4.0		

TABLE III-5 continued

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
31	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/Products.	44	3.43	.73	n:	24	16	3	1	8
					%:	54.5	36.4	6.8	2.3	
32	The Culminating Event focused on the creative process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product.	46	3.50	.66	n:	26	18	1	1	8
					%:	56.5	39.1	2.2	2.2	
33	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate.	46	3.52	.59	n:	26	18	2	0	7
					%:	56.5	39.1	4.3		
34	My participation in the Teacher Workshops has or will benefit my students.	37	3.38	.55	n:	15	21	1	0	16
					%:	40.5	56.8	2.7		
35	My participation in Special Events (e.g., Field Trips, Performances) has or will benefit my students.	31	3.42	.56	n:	14	16	1	0	19
					%:	45.2	51.6	3.2		

TABLE III-5 continued

Key: 7.00=Greatest problem interfering with effective program implementation
1.00=Least problem interfering with effective program implementation
Range=Highest and lowest values assigned by respondents to the problem

Item		N	X	S	Range
43	Amount of time available for initial planning	44	3.23	1.71	7.00-1.00
44	Amount of time available for ongoing, regular planning/evaluation	45	3.80	1.65	7.00-1.00
45	Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period).	45	3.20	1.60	6.00-1.00
46	Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks).	45	3.67	1.75	7.00-1.00
47	Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium).	45	3.49	1.93	6.00-1.00
48	Scheduling	37	3.51	1.71	6.00-1.00

Table III-6

Artist Survey Responses: Number of valid artist responses per item; item means; item standard deviations; number of responses by item, per response category; and percent of responses, by item, per response category

KEY: N=number of valid artists' responses used to calculate M, S, & %
M=mean of all valid artists' responses to the item
S=Standard Deviation of valid artists' responses differ from the mean
(i.e., average amount artists' responses differ from the mean)

4.00=Strongly agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly disagree
N/A=Does not apply

n=number of artists selecting the response to an item
%=percent of artists selecting the response to an item

NOTE: Item numbers refer to the sequencing of items on the Artist Questionnaire.
In the table below, items are grouped by Domain.

Domain: Teacher-Artist Partnership

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
8	During this residency, the participating teachers attended most of the student workshops	12	3.59	.67	n:	8	3	1	0	0
					&:	66.7	25.0	8.3		
9	The teachers actively participated in most of the student workshops	11	3.64	.51	n:	7	4	0	0	0
					%:	63.6	36.4			

TABLE III-6 continued

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
10	The teachers and I collaborated in planning most of the student workshops	11	2.00	.78	n:	0	3	5	3	0
					%:	0	27.3	45.5	27.3	
11	Most of the workshop planning was initiated by teachers	12	1.50	.52	n:	0	0	6	6	1
					%:	0	0	50.0	50.0	
12	I initiated most of the workshop planning	13	3.85	.38	n:	11	2	0	0	0
					%:	84.6	15.4			
13	I frequently offered suggestions for classroom follow-up activities	13	3.15	.80	n:	5	5	3	0	0
					%:	38.5	38.5	23.1		
14	The teachers usually used my suggestions for follow-up activity	10	2.90	.88	n:	2	6	1	1	2
					%:	20.0	60.0	10.0	10.0	
15	The teachers often came up with follow-up activities on their own	13	2.69	.86	n:	1	9	1	2	0
					%:	7.7	69.2	7.7	15.4	
16	I actively participated in the Planning/ Orientation meeting(s)	13	3.46	.88	n:	9	1	3	0	0
					%:	69.2	7.7	23.1		

TABLE III-6 continued

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
21	I actively participated in the Final Evaluation meeting	12	3.67	.49	n:	8	4	0	0	0
					%:	66.7	33.3			
33	The workshop knowledge and skills were reinforced in the regular classroom by the classroom teacher	9	3.22	.68	n:	3	5	1	0	1
					%:	33.3	55.6	11.1		
37	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers and artists collaborate	13	3.54	.52	n:	7	6	0	0	0
					%:	53.8	46.2			
	Domain: Cognitive & Knowledge Skills									
30	The students learned the knowledge and skills that I taught	13	3.46	.52	n:	6	7	0	0	0
					%:	46.2	53.8			
40	Students accurately executed activities based on the knowledge and skills presented in the workshops	13	3.46	.52	n:	6	7	0	0	0
					%:	46.2	53.8			

Domain: Higher Order Thinking

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
31	The workshop knowledge and skills learned by the students carried over from workshop to workshop	12	3.58	.52	n:	7	5	0	0	0
					%:	58.3	41.7			
32	The workshop knowledge and skills learned by the students carried over into their regular classwork	6	3.33	.52	n:	2	4	0	0	3
					%:	33.3	66.7			

Domain: Affects and Attitudes

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
34	As a result of this residency, the students increased their appreciation of the arts	13	3.62	.51	n:	8	5	0	0	0
					%:	61.5	38.5			
35	The students' attitudes toward themselves and their work improved throughout the residency	13	3.46	.52	n:	6	7	0	0	0
					%:	46.2	53.8			
36	The students' behavior has improved throughout the residency	11	3.55	.52	n:	6	5	0	0	2
					%:	54.5	45.5			

TABLE III-6 continued

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
42	Students were engaged (e.g., they maintained eye contact with me during instruction and focused their attention on workshop tasks)	11	3.64	.51	n:	7	4	0	0	0
					%:	63.6	36.4			
43	When appropriate, students worked cooperatively	12	3.42	.52	n:	5	7	0	0	0
					%:	41.7	58.3			
44	Students showed pride in their accomplishments	13	3.62	.51	n:	8	5	0	0	0
					%:	61.5	38.5			
45	Students took care with the activities	13	3.46	.66	n:	7	5	1	0	0
					%:	53.8	38.5	7.7		
46	Students seemed to enjoy the workshops (e.g., often smiled)	13	3.00	.41	n:	1	11	1	0	0
					%:	7.7	84.6	7.7		
	Domain: Communication									
38	Students shared outside-of-school experiences with me that were related to the Residency	11	3.55	.52	n:	6	5	0	0	2
					%:	54.5	45.5			

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
39	Students shared classroom experiences with me that were related to the Residency	13	3.23	.60	n:	4	8	1	0	0
					%:	30.8	61.5	7.7		
41	Students demonstrated that they understood my instructions	12	3.58	.52	n:	7	5	0	0	0
					%:	58.3	41.7			

Domain: Other (Program Management and Implementation

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
17	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the teachers	13	3.62	.51	n:	8	5	0	0	0
					%:	61.5	38.5			
18	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were useful to me	13	3.39	.77	n:	7	4	2	0	0
					%:	53.8	30.8	15.4		
19	It was important for a Music Center representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s)	13	3.54	.52	n:	7	6	0	0	0
					%:	53.8	46.2			
20	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency	13	3.39	.96	n:	8	3	1	1	0
					%:	61.5	23.1	7.7	7.7	

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
22	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the teachers	12	3.58	.52	n:	7	5	0	0	0
					%:	58.3	41.7			
23	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me	12	3.50	.52	n:	6	6	0	0	0
					%:	50.0	50.0			
24	It was important for a Music Center representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting	12	3.42	.52	n:	5	7	0	0	0
					%:	41.7	58.3			
25	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies	12	3.50	.52	n:	6	6	0	0	0
					%:	50.0	50.0			
26	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/ Products	10	2.60	.84	n:	2	2	6	0	3
					%:	20.0	20.0	60.0		
27	The Culminating Event focused on the creative process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product	11	3.27	.79	n:	5	4	2	0	2
					%:	45.5	36.4	18.2		

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
28	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate	11	3.55	.52	n:	6	5	0	0	2
					%:	54.5	45.5			
29	Teachers' participation in the Special Events (e.g., teacher workshops) was such that it should benefit their students	9	3.22	.67	n:	3	5	1	0	3
					%:	33.3	55.6	11.1		

Key: 7.00=Greatest problem interfering with effective program implementation
1.00=Least problem interfering with effective program implementation
Range=Highest and lowest values assigned to the problem by respondents

	Item	N	M	S	Range
47	Amount of time available for initial, collaborative planning	9	2.44	1.74	5.00-1.00
48	Amount of time available for ongoing, regular planning/evaluation	11	4.36	1.50	7.00-1.00
49	Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period)	9	3.56	2.07	7.00-1.00

TABLE III-6 continued

	Item	N	M	S	Range
50	Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks)	10	4.80	2.20	7.00-1.00
51	Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium)	11	4.09	2.02	7.00-1.00
52	Scheduling	12	4.50	1.98	7.00-1.00

Table III-7

Parent Survey Responses: Number of parents responding to each item; item means; item standard deviations; number of responses, by item, per response category; and percent of responses, by item, per response category.

KEY: N=number of parent responses used to calculate M, S, & %.
M=mean of all valid parents' responses to the item
S=Standard Deviation of valid parents' responses to the item
(i.e., average amount that parents' responses
differ from the mean)
n=the number of parents selecting the response to the item
%=percent of students selecting the response to the item

4.00=All
3.00=Most
2.00=Few
1.00=None
DK=Do not know

NOTE: Item numbers refer to the sequencing of items on the Parent Questionnaire. Items are grouped below by Domain.

Domain: Communication

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	DK
6	My child often talks to me about the Artist-in-Residence	21	3.52	.60	n:	12	8	1	0	0
					%:	57.1	38.1	4.8		
20	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child does a better job of following instructions accurately.	20	2.95	.69	n:	4	11	5	0	1
					%:	20.0	55.0	25.0		

TABLE III-7 continued

Domain: Affects and Attitudes

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	DK
7	My child has enjoyed working with an Artist-in-Residence	20	3.65	.59	n:	14	5	1	0	1
					%:	70.0	25.0	5.0		
8	My child looks forward to coming to school on the days the artist is there.	20	3.45	.69	n:	11	7	2	0	1
					%:	55.0	35.0	10.0		
13	My child feels good about what he/she accomplished while working with the Artist-in-Residence.	20	3.70	.47	n:	14	6	0	0	1
					%:	70.0	30.0			
14	My child has always been interested in the arts.	19	3.42	.51	n:	8	11	0	0	2
					%:	42.1	57.9			
15	My child is now interested in the arts.	20	3.30	.73	n:	9	8	3	0	1
					%:	45.0	40.0	15.0		
16	My child wants to continue to be involved in the arts in the future.	19	3.47	.61	n:	10	8	1	0	2
					%:	52.6	42.1	5.3		
17	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child reads more about the arts.	19	3.00	.88	n:	7	5	7	0	2
					%:	36.8	26.3	36.8		

TABLE III-7 continued

Domain: Higher Order Thinking

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	DK
9	At home, my child uses ideas or skills taught by the Artist-in-Residence.	21	3.14	.91	n:	9	7	4	1	0
					%:	42.9	33.3	19.0	4.8	
10	working with an Artist-in-residence helped improve the rest of my child's schoolwork.	19	3.00	.88	n:	6	8	4	1	2
					%:	31.6	42.1	21.1	5.3	

Domain: Cognitive Knowledge and Skills

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	DK
18	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child's homework has improved.	19	2.90	.81	n:	5	7	7	0	1
					%:	26.3	36.8	36.8		
19	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child's grades have improved.	19	2.84	.77	n:	4	8	7	0	2
					%:	21.1	42.1	36.8		

TABLE III-7 continued

Domain: Socialization

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	DK
21	Since working with an Artist-in-Residence, my child gets along better with others.	20	3.05	.76	n:	6	9	5	0	1
					%:	30.0	45.0	25.0		

Domain: Other

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	DK
11	I would like my child to have more chances to work with an Artist-in-Residence.	21	3.57	.60	n:	13	7	1	0	0
					%:	61.9	33.3	4.8		
12	It is very important for the schools to teach the arts.	21	3.67	.48	n:	14	7	0	0	0
					%:	66.7	33.3			

Table III-8

Administrator Survey Responses: Number of administrators responding to each item; item means; item standard deviations; number of responses per item, number of responses, by item, per response category; and percent of responses, by item, per response category.

KEY: N=number of administrators' responses used to calculate M, S, & %
M=mean of all valid administrators' responses to the item
S=Standard Deviation of valid administrators' responses to the item
(i.e., average amount administrators' responses differ from the mean)
n=the number of administrators selecting the response to the item
%=percent of administrators selecting the response to the item

2.00=All
1.00=Most
0.00=None

NOTE: Item numbers refer to the sequencing of items on the Administrator Questionnaire. In the Table below, items are grouped below by Domain.

Domain: Teacher-Artist Partnership

						Response Categories		
Item		N	M	S		2.00	1.00	0.00
9	I attended ___ of the Orientation / Planning meeting(s) for this residency.	9	1.89	.33	n:	8	1	0
					%:	88.9	11.1	0.00
10	I attended ___ of the special events for this residency (e.g., teacher workshops, field trips, assemblies).	9	1.22	.83	n:	4	3	2
					%:	44.4	33.3	22.2
11	I attended ___ of the Culmination Event for this residency.	9	1.33	1.00	n:	6	3	0
					%:	66.7	33.3	0

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories		
						2.00	1.00	0.00
12	I attended ___ of the Evaluation Meeting for this residency.	8	1.88	.35	n:	7	1	0
					%:	87.5	12.5	
13	I was available to facilitate ___ of the scheduling associated with the Residency or provided a well-informed substitute.	7	2.00	.00	n:	7	0	0
					%:	100.0		

Key: 4.00=Strongly Agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly Disagree
N/A=Does not apply, e.g., not scheduled, no opportunity to observe, etc.

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
14	The Music Center was timely in providing me, or the School-Residency Coordinator with all necessary residency schedules and materials.	8	3.75	.46	n:	6	2	0	0	0
					%:	75.0	25.0			
29	All teachers at this school benefited by participating in Teacher Workshops presented by the Resident Artist.	8	3.25	.46	n:	2	6	0	0	1
					%:	25.0	75.0	0	0	

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
30	Teachers participating in the Residency benefited by participating in special Events (e.g., field trips, performances).	5	3.00	1.23	n: %:	2 40.0	2 40.0	0 0	1 20.0	4 44.4
37	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers and artists collaborate.	9	3.78	.44	n: %:	7 77.8	2 22.2	0	0	0
38	In this residency, teachers and artists truly collaborated.	9	3.44	.73	n: %:	5 55.6	3 33.1	1 11.1	0	0

Domain: Cognitive Knowledge and Skills

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
31	The students learned the cognitive knowledge and skills taught by this artist.	9	3.67	.50	n %	6 66.7	3 33.3	0	0	0

TABLE III-8 continued

Domain: Higher Order Thinking

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories 4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
32	The knowledge and skills the students learned from this artist carried over into their regular classwork.	8	3.63	.52	n	5	3	0	0	1
					%	62.5	37.5	0	0	

Domain: Affects and Attitudes

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories 4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
33	Students increased their appreciation of the arts from working with this artist.	9	3.78	.44	n:	7	2	0	0	0
					%:	77.8	22.2			
34	Students gained more positive attitudes about themselves from working with this artist.	9	3.67	.50	n:	6	3	0	0	0
					%:	66.7	33.3			
35	Students gained more positive attitudes about school from working with this artist.	9	3.56	.53	n:	5	4	0	0	0
					%:	55.6	44.4			

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
36	Students' behavior has improved as a result of working with this artist.	7	3.57	.79	n:	5	1	1	0	2
					%:	71.4	14.3	14.3	0	

Domain: Other (Program Management and Implementation

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
15	I, or the School-Residency coordinator, was timely in providing the Music Center with schedule changes.	7	3.43	.79	n:	4	2	1	0	1
					%:	57.1	28.6	14.3	0	12.5
16	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the artist.	9	3.56	.53	n:	5	4	0	0	0
					%:	55.6	44.4			
17	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the teachers.	9	3.56	.53	n:	5	4	0	0	0
					%:	55.6	44.4			
18	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) were useful to me.	9	3.56	.53	n:	5	4	0	0	0
					%:	55.6	44.4			

TABLE III-8 continued

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories 4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
19	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s).	9	3.33	.71	n:	4	4	1	0	0
					%:	44.1	44.4	11.1		
20	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency.	9	3.78	.44	n:	7	2	0	0	0
					%:	77.8	22.2			
21	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the artist.	8	3.50	.76	n:	5	2	1	0	0
					%:	62.5	25.0	12.5		
22	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the teachers.	8	3.63	.74	n:	6	1	1	0	0
					%:	75.0	12.5	12.5		
23	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me.	8	3.63	.74	n:	6	1	1	0	0
					%:	75.0	12.5	12.5		
24	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting.	8	3.38	.74	n:	4	3	1	0	0
					%:	50.0	37.5	12.5		
25	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies.	8	3.75	.46	n:	6	2	0	0	0
					%:	75.0	25.0			

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
26	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/Products.	6	3.33	.82	n:	3	2	1	0	3
					%:	50.0	33.3	16.7	0	
27	The Culminating Event focused on the creative process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product.	6	3.50	.55	n:	3	3	0	0	2
					%:	50.0	50.0	0	0	
28	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate.	7	3.57	.54	n:	57.1	42.9	0	0	2
					%:			0	0	

Key 4.00=Excellent
3.00=Good
2.00=Fair
1.00=Poor

Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
39	The artist's effectiveness with students was ___.	9	3.89	.33	n:	8	1	0	0	0
					%:	88.9	11.1			
40	The artist's effectiveness with teachers was ___.	9	3.78	.44	n:	7	2	0	0	0
					%:	77.8	22.2			

TABLE III-8 continued

Key: 7.00=Greatest problem interfering with effective program implementation
1.00=Least problem interfering with effective program implementation
Range=Highest and lowest values assigned to the problem by respondents

Item		N	M	S	Range
41	Amount of time available for initial planning.	8	3.88	2.03	7.00-1.00
42	Amount of time available for ongoing, regular planning/evaluation.	9	4.00	1.87	7.00-1.00
43	Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period).	8	3.38	1.51	6.00-2.00
44	Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks).	8	3.63	1.30	5.00-1.00
45	Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium).	9	3.33	2.18	6.00-1.00
46	Scheduling	9	3.89	2.32	6.00-1.00

Table III-9

School-Residency Coordinator Survey Responses: Number of coordinators responding to each item; item means; item standard deviations; number of responses per item; number of responses, by item, per response category; and percent of responses, by item, per response category.

KEY: N=number of coordinators' responses used to calculate M, S, & %
M=mean of all valid coordinators' responses to the item
S=Standard Deviation of valid coordinators' responses to the item
(i.e., average amount coordinators' responses differ from the mean)
n=the number of coordinators selecting the response to the item
%=percent of coordinators selecting the response to the item

2.00=All
1.00=Most
0.00=None

NOTE: Item numbers refer to the sequencing of items on the School-Residency Coordinator Questionnaire.
In the Table below, items are grouped below by Domain.

Domain: Partnership

						Response Categories		
Item		N	M	S		2.00	1.00	0.00
11	I attended ___ of the Orientation/Planning meeting(s) for this residency.	9	1.44	.88	n:	6	1	2
					%:	66.7	11.1	22.2
12	I attended ___ of the special events for this residency (e.g., teacher workshops, field trips, assemblies).	10	1.50	.85	n:	7	1	2
					%:	70.0	10.0	20.0
13	I attended ___ of the Culmination Event for this residency.	9	1.56	.88	n:	7	0	2
					%:	77.8	0	22.2
14	I attended ___ of the Evaluation Meeting for this residency.	10	1.40	.84	n:	6	2	2
					%:	60.0	20.0	20.0

TABLE III-9 Continued

Key: 4.00=Strongly Agree
3.00=Agree
2.00=Disagree
1.00=Strongly Disagree
N/A=Does not apply, e.g., not scheduled, no opportunity to observe, etc.

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
15	The Music Center was timely in providing me with all necessary residency schedules and materials.	10	3.70	.48	n:	7	3	0	0	0
					%:	70.0	30.0			
16	I was timely in providing the Music Center with schedule changes.	10	3.50	.53	n:	5	5	0	0	0
					%:	50.0	50.0			
30	All teachers at this school benefited from the Teacher Workshop(s) presented by the Artist-in-Residence.	6	2.33	.82	n:	0	3	2	1	4
					%:	0	50.0	33.3	16.7	
31	All teachers at this school benefited from the Special Events (e.g., Performances, Culminating Event), provided through the Artist-in-Residence.	7	3.57	.54	n:	4	3	0	0	3
					%:	57.1	42.9			
32	Teachers participating in the Residency benefited from the Special Events (e.g., Teacher Workshops, Field Trips) provided through the Artist-in-Residence.	6	3.33	.82	n:	3	2	1	0	4
					%:	50.0	33.3	16.7		

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
40	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers and artists collaborate.	10	4.00	.00	n:	10	0	0	0	0
					%:	100				
41	In this residency, teachers and artists truly collaborated.	9	3.44	.73	n:	5	3	1	0	0
					%:	55.6	33.3	11.1		

Domain: Cognitive Knowledge and Skills

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
33	The students learned the cognitive knowledge and skills taught by this artist.	9	3.56	.53	n:	5	4	0	0	1
					%:	55.6	44.4			

Domain: Higher Order Thinking

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
34	The knowledge and skills the students learned from this artist carried over into their regular classwork.	8	3.50	.54	n:	4	4	0	0	0
					%:	50.0	50.0			

Domain: Affects and Attitudes

Item		N	M	S		Response Categories				
						4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
35	Students increased their appreciation of the arts from working with this artist.	9	3.89	.33	n:	8	1	0	0	0
					%:	88.9	11.1			
36	Students gained more positive attitudes about themselves from working with this artist.	9	3.89	.33	n:	8	1	0	0	0
					%:	88.9	11.1			
37	Students gained more positive attitudes about school from working with this artist.	9	3.33	.50	n:	3	6	0	0	0
					%:	33.3	66.7			
38	Students' behavior has improved as a result of working with this artist.	7	3.00	.58	n:	1	5	1	0	1
					%:	14.3	71.4	14.3		
39	Students enjoyed their experiences with this artist.	10	3.90	.32	n:	9	1	0	0	0
					%:	90.0	10.0			

TABLE III-9 Continued

Domain: Other (Program Management and Implementation)

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
17	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the artist.	10	3.50	.53	n:	5	5	0	0	0
					%:	50.0	50.0			
18	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the teachers.	10	3.50	.71	n:	6	3	1	0	0
					%:	60.0	30.0	10.0		
19	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) were useful to me.	8	3.38	.52	n:	3	5	0	0	1
					%:	37.5	62.5			
20	It was important for a Music Center representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s).	10	3.40	.52	n	4	6	0	0	0
					%	40.0	60.0			
21	The Orientation/Planning Meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency.	10	3.60	.70	n	7	2	1	0	0
					%	70.0	20.0	10.0		
22	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the artist.	9	3.44	.73	n:	5	3	1	0	0
					%:	55.6	33.3	11.1		
23	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the teachers.	9	3.33	.71	n:	4	4	1	0	0
					%:	44.4	44.4	11.1		
24	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me.	8	3.38	.74	n:	4	3	1	0	1
					%:	50.0	37.5	12.5		

TABLE III-9 Continued

						Response Categories				
Item		N	M	S		4.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	N/A
25	It was important for a Music Center representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting.	9	3.78	.44	n:	7	2	0	0	0
					%:	77.8	22.2			
26	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies.	9	3.67	.50	n:	6	3	0	0	0
					%:	66.7	33.3			
27	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/Products.	8	3.38	.92	n:	5	1	2	0	1
					%:	62.5	12.5	25.0		
28	The Culminating Event focused on the creative process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product.	8	3.75	.71	n:	7	0	1	0	1
					%:	87.5	0	12.5		
29	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate.	8	3.38	.92	n:	5	1	2	0	2
					%:	62.5	12.5	25.0		
42	This artist worked effectively with the participating teachers.	10	3.70	.48	n:	7	3	0	0	0
					%:	70.0	30.0			

TABLE III-9 Continued

Key: 7.00=Greatest problem interfering with effective program implementation
1.00=Least problem interfering with effective program implementation
Range=Highest and lowest values assigned to the problem by respondents

Item		N	M	S	Range
43	Amount of time available for initial planning.	9	3.11	1.54	6.00-1.00
44	Amount of time available for on-going, regular planning/ evaluation.	10	3.40	1.27	5.00-2.00
45	Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period).	10	3.30	1.95	6.00-1.00
46	Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks).	9	3.00	1.58	5.00-1.00
47	Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium).	10	3.70	1.95	7.00-1.00
48	Scheduling	9	5.67	.71	6.00-4.00

Table III-10

Pre and Post Comparisons (t-tests), Means, and Standard Deviations for Classroom Achievement, Effort, and Work Habit/Cooperation Grades **for All Students Combined**

Key: n=number of valid cases; used to calculate M, S, and t
t=a value yielded by a statistical procedure (t-test) that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two means. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p.
p=the probability that the difference represented by t is due to chance.
*=t represents a statistically significant difference at $p \leq .05$
M=Mean
S=Standard Deviation

4.00=A or Outstanding
3.5=Excellent
3.00=B or Good
2.00=C or Satisfactory
1.00=D or Unsatisfactory/Needs to Improve

Grade	n	t	p		Pre	Post
Reading Achievement	342	-7.73	<.01*	M:	1.89	2.16
				S:	.84	.94
Reading Effort	345	-6.72	<.01*	M:	2.38	2.66
				S:	.97	1.01
Written Composition Achievement	345	-7.80	<.01*	M:	1.85	2.16
				S:	.83	.91
Written Composition Effort	343	-4.92	<.01*	M:	2.38	2.61
				S:	.99	1.01
Spelling Achievement	344	-7.49	<.01*	M:	2.10	2.42
				S:	1.05	1.11
Spelling Effort	341	-6.21	<.01*	M:	2.45	2.74
				S:	1.08	1.12
Handwriting Achievement	347	-5.96	<.01*	M:	2.16	2.37
				S:	.84	.84
Handwriting Effort	348	-6.36	<.01*	M:	2.39	2.67
				S:	.89	.90

TABLE III-10 continued

Grade	n	t	p		Pre	Post
Oral Language Achievement	341	-6.19	<.01*	M:	2.36	2.56
				S:	.77	.85
Oral Language Effort	344	-6.34	<.01*	M:	2.56	2.81
				S:	.84	.91
English as a Second Language Achievement	91	-5.22	<.01*	M:	2.29	2.58
				S:	.77	.79
English as a Second Language Effort	105	-4.47	<.01*	M:	2.77	3.03
				S:	.87	.87
Mathematics Achievement	343	-2.68	<.01*	M:	2.13	2.24
				S:	.91	.96
Mathematics Effort	344	-1.14	.25	M:	2.63	2.69
				S:	.96	1.04
Science Achievement	344	-4.94	<.01*	M:	2.06	2.24
				S:	.69	.86
Science Effort	343	-4.72	<.01*	M:	2.42	2.62
				S:	.83	.89
Social Studies Achievement	343	-4.27	<.01*	M:	2.11	2.26
				S:	.74	.80
Social Studies Effort	355	-3.82	<.01*	M:	2.48	2.62
				S:	.84	.90
Health Education Achievement	356	-5.83	<.01*	M:	2.27	2.46
				S:	.62	.80
Health Education Effort	357	-6.80	<.01*	M:	2.46	2.69
				S:	.74	.86
Music Achievement	356	-9.84	<.01*	M:	2.46	2.75
				S:	.66	.80
Music Effort	357	-8.52	<.01*	M:	2.62	2.88
				S:	.76	.86

TABLE III-10 continued

Grade	n	t	p		Pre	Post
Art Achievement	357	-7.11	<.01*	M:	2.58	2.79
				S:	.75	.83
Art Effort	356	-6.55	<.01*	M:	2.81	3.04
				S:	.83	.89
Physical Education Achievement	357	-7.83	<.01*	M:	2.54	2.76
				S:	.72	.81
Physical Education Effort	358	-7.94	<.01*	M:	2.69	2.95
				S:	.80	.88
Listens to/Follows Instructions	358	-5.09	<.01*	M:	2.08	2.27
				S:	.93	.95
Finishes Work on Time	359	-5.12	<.01*	M:	2.20	2.41
				S:	.98	1.00
Keeps Own materials in Order	359	-4.73	<.01*	M:	2.47	2.63
				S:	.88	.89
Is Dependable	359	-4.55	<.01*	M:	2.45	2.61
				S:	.89	.95
Assumes Responsibility for Actions	358	-4.81	<.01*	M:	2.40	2.57
				S:	.89	.96
Works/Plays well with Others	357	-3.17	<.01*	M:	2.45	2.55
				S:	.88	.92
Respects Rights/ Property of Others	359	-4.07	<.01*	M:	2.51	2.64
				S:	.91	.92
Is Courteous	359	-2.40	.02*	M:	2.55	2.62
				S:	.94	.92
Obeys School Rules	359	-4.18	<.01*	M:	2.25	2.35
				S:	.77	.83

Table III-11

Pre and Post Comparisons (t-test), Means, and Standard Deviations for Classroom achievement, Effort, and Work Habit/Cooperation Grades **by School**

Key: A=School A (71% Hisp., 13% Asian, 11% Cauc., 5% other)
B=School B (75% Black, 25% Hisp.)
C=School C (70% Black, 30% Hisp.)

n=number of valid cases; used to calculate M, S, & t
M=Mean
S=Standard Deviation
t=a value yielded by a statistical procedure (t-test) that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two means. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p.
p=the probability that the difference represented by t is due to chance.

*=t represents a statistically significant difference (p ≤ .05)

4.00=A or Outstanding
3.5=Excellent
3.00=B or Good
2.00=C or Satisfactory
1.00=D or Less than Satisfactory/Needs to Improve
0.00=F or Unsatisfactory

Grade	School	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Reading Achievement	A:	169	2.03 (.86)	2.31 (.93)	-5.12	<.01*
	B:	56	1.73 (.75)	1.73 (.82)	.00	1.00
	C:	117	1.76 (.82)	2.15 (.96)	-7.11	<.01*
Reading Effort	A:	172	2.65 (.96)	2.91 (.92)	-4.38	<.01*
	B:	56	1.70 (.78)	1.86 (.82)	-2.26	.03*
	C:	117	2.31 (.91)	2.68 (1.03)	-4.63	<.01*
Written Composition Achievement	A:	172	2.09 (.84)	2.41 (.90)	-5.10	<.01*
	B:	56	1.59 (.71)	1.61 (.82)	- .26	.80
	C:	117	1.62 (.76)	2.05 (.83)	-7.13	<.01*

TABLE III-11 continued

Grade	School	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Written Composition Effort	A:	170	2.76 (.96)	2.91 (.91)	-2.11	.04*
	B:	56	1.63 (.70)	1.71 (.83)	-1.22	.23
	C:	117	2.19 (.89)	2.61 (.98)	-5.02	<.01*
Spelling Achievement	A:	171	2.44 (1.09)	2.75 (1.07)	-5.41	<.01*
	B:	56	1.75 (.77)	1.75 (.94)	.00	1.00
	C:	117	1.79 (.96)	2.24 (1.08)	-6.09	<.01*
Spelling Effort	A:	169	2.85 (1.07)	3.18 (.94)	-4.91	<.01*
	B:	56	1.77 (.81)	1.82 (.92)	- .62	.54
	C:	116	2.21 (.97)	2.53 (1.13)	-4.04	<.01*
Handwriting Achievement	A:	174	2.34 (.86)	2.48 (.85)	-2.85	<.01*
	B:	56	1.91 (.55)	2.05 (.72)	-1.93	.05*
	C:	117	2.02 (.86)	2.37 (.84)	-5.33	<.01*
Handwriting Effort	A:	175	2.60 (.88)	2.85 (.89)	-3.91	<.01*
	B:	56	1.91 (.61)	2.13 (.61)	-3.03	<.01*
	C:	117	2.32 (.92)	2.68 (.92)	-4.29	<.01*
Oral Language Achievement	A:	171	2.57 (.74)	2.71 (.80)	-3.01	<.01*
	B:	56	1.96 (.50)	2.04 (.47)	-1.27	.21
	C:	114	2.23 (.82)	2.61 (.97)	-5.78	<.01*
Oral Language Effort	A:	174	2.80 (.80)	3.00 (.85)	-3.59	<.01*
	B:	56	2.00 (.54)	2.05 (.48)	- .90	.37
	C:	114	2.47 (.89)	2.88 (.97)	-5.66	<.01*
English as a Second Language Achievement	A:	24	2.42 (.58)	2.83 (.70)	-3.50	<.01*
	B:	11	1.91 (.70)	2.00 (.63)	- .56	.59
	C:	56	2.32 (.83)	2.59 (.80)	-4.13	<.01*
English as a Second Language Effort	A:	28	2.86 (.65)	3.07 (.77)	-2.27	.03*
	B:	11	2.18 (.75)	2.09 (.70)	1.00	.34
	C:	66	2.83 (.94)	3.17 (.85)	-4.23	<.01*

TABLE III-11 continued

Grade	School	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Mathematics Achievement	A:	184	2.43 (.92)	2.42 (1.00)	.19	.85
	B:	43	1.77 (.68)	1.70 (.64)	1.14	.26
	C:	116	1.80 (.78)	2.16 (.90)	-5.43	<.01*
Mathematics Effort	A:	184	2.99 (.89)	2.97 (1.00)	.24	.81
	B:	43	1.81 (.66)	1.79 (.68)	.26	.80
	C:	117	2.38 (.89)	2.56 (1.01)	-2.55	.01*
Science Achievement	A:	184	2.05 (.70)	2.22 (.87)	-3.39	<.01*
	B:	43	1.77 (.48)	1.81 (.50)	- .81	.42
	C:	117	2.18 (.73)	2.42 (.88)	-3.56	<.01*
Science Effort	A:	183	2.57 (.83)	2.75 (.90)	-2.85	<.01*
	B:	43	1.77 (.57)	1.86 (.52)	-1.27	.21
	C:	117	2.42 (.81)	2.68 (.86)	-3.90	<.01*
Social Studies Achievement	A:	183	2.15 (.79)	2.25 (.82)	-1.83	.07
	B:	43	1.79 (.41)	1.79 (.47)	.00	1.00
	C:	117	2.16 (.72)	2.44 (.80)	-4.97	<.01*
Social Studies Effort	A:	182	2.69 (.85)	2.80 (.88)	-1.99	<.05*
	B:	56	1.91 (.44)	1.89 (.45)	.44	.66
	C:	117	2.43 (.85)	2.69 (.91)	-4.03	<.01*
Health Education Achievement	A:	184	2.38 (.66)	2.59 (.84)	-4.28	<.01*
	B:	56	1.98 (.13)	1.96 (.27)	.57	.57
	C:	116	2.23 (.66)	2.50 (.80)	-4.33	<.01*
Health Education Effort	A:	184	2.63 (.77)	2.91 (.84)	-6.16	<.01*
	B:	56	2.04 (.27)	1.95 (.23)	2.32	.02*
	C:	117	2.39 (.78)	2.68 (.88)	-4.37	<.01*
Music Achievement	A:	183	2.61 (.70)	2.97 (.79)	-8.07	<.01*
	B:	56	2.07 (.26)	2.05 (.23)	1.00	.32
	C:	117	2.42 (.63)	2.74 (.79)	-6.38	<.01*
Music Effort	A:	183	2.87 (.80)	3.15 (.84)	-6.13	<.01*
	B:	56	2.09 (.29)	2.09 (.29)	.00	1.00
	C:	118	2.48 (.68)	2.84 (.83)	-6.23	<.01*

TABLE III-11 continued

Grade	School	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Art Achievement	A:	184	2.84 (.70)	3.06 (.78)	-4.69	<.01*
	B:	56	2.16 (.37)	2.11 (.31)	1.76	.08
	C:	117	2.37 (.81)	2.69 (.88)	-6.95	<.01*
Art Effort	A:	182	3.18 (.75)	3.40 (.75)	-4.27	<.01*
	B:	56	2.16 (.37)	2.18 (.39)	-1.00	.32
	C:	118	2.56 (.82)	2.90 (.96)	-5.12	<.01*
Physical Education Achievement	A:	184	2.74 (.68)	3.02 (.75)	-6.52	<.01*
	B:	56	2.05 (.30)	2.00 (.19)	1.76	.08
	C:	117	2.45 (.79)	2.73 (.85)	-5.37	<.01*
Physical Education Effort	A:	184	2.98 (.72)	3.27 (.76)	-6.43	<.01*
	B:	56	2.07 (.26)	2.02 (.13)	1.76	.08
	C:	118	2.54 (.86)	2.90 (.92)	-5.54	<.01*
Listens to/Follows Directions	A:	184	2.30 (.92)	2.50 (.89)	-3.88	<.01*
	B:	56	1.82 (.81)	1.75 (.72)	1.00	.32
	C:	118	1.86 (.91)	2.17 (1.02)	-4.20	<.01*
Finishes Work on Time	A:	185	2.34 (.96)	2.57 (.92)	-3.64	<.01*
	B:	56	1.84 (.78)	1.80 (.72)	.53	.60
	C:	118	2.14 (1.03)	2.45 (1.12)	-4.25	<.01*
Keeps Own Materials in Order	A:	185	2.66 (.85)	2.75 (.83)	-1.71	<.09
	B:	56	1.96 (.76)	2.04 (.74)	-1.27	.21
	C:	118	2.41 (.88)	2.74 (.93)	-5.07	<.01*
Is Dependable	A:	185	2.62 (.89)	2.75 (.89)	-2.93	<.01*
	B:	56	2.00 (.89)	1.96 (.87)	.63	.53
	C:	118	2.41 (.83)	2.70 (.95)	-4.04	<.01*
Assumes Responsibility for Actions	A:	185	2.61 (.89)	2.73 (.90)	-2.77	<.01*
	B:	55	2.05 (.76)	1.87 (.70)	2.84	<.01*
	C:	118	2.23 (.88)	2.65 (1.02)	-5.75	<.01*

TABLE III-11 continued

Grade	School	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Works/Plays well with Others	A:	184	2.73 (.86)	2.79 (.88)	-1.78	.08
	B:	55	2.09 (.75)	2.05 (.68)	.50	.62
	C:	118	2.18 (.83)	2.40 (.96)	-3.19	<.01*
Respects Rights/Property of Others	A:	185	2.79 (.89)	2.88 (.83)	-2.67	<.01*
	B:	56	2.18 (.77)	2.09 (.77)	1.53	.13
	C:	118	2.24 (.86)	2.53 (.99)	-4.02	<.01*
Is Courteous	A:	185	2.80 (.90)	2.83 (.88)	- .66	.51
	B:	56	2.21 (.76)	2.13 (.66)	1.30	.20
	C:	118	2.31 (.98)	2.54 (.98)	-3.98	<.01*
Obeys School Rules	A:	185	2.69 (.87)	2.79 (.87)	-2.31	.02*
	B:	56	2.05 (.77)	2.11 (.80)	- .77	.44
	C:	118	2.31 (.80)	2.53 (.86)	-3.72	<.01*

Table III-12

Pre-Residency and Post-Residency Comparisons (t-tests), Mean Grades, and Standard Deviations by **Type of Residency**

Key: DA=Dance
DR=Drama
MU=Music
VA=Visual Arts
WD=Writing/Drama
t=a value yielded by a statistical procedure (t-test) that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two means. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p.
p=the probability that the difference represented by t is due to chance.

M=Mean
S=Standard Deviation
n=number of valid cases; used to calculate M, & S

*=t represents a statistically significant difference ($p \leq .05$)

4.00=A or Outstanding
3.5=Excellent
3.00=B or Good
2.00=C or Satisfactory
1.00=D or Less than Satisfactory/Needs to Improve
0.00=F or Unsatisfactory

Grade	Residency Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Reading Achievement	DA:	78	2.19 (.97)	2.35 (1.06)	-2.53	.01*
	DR:	98	1.71 (.72)	1.98 (.89)	-4.37	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.00 (1.03)	2.44 (1.14)	-4.55	<.01*
	VA:	36	1.58 (.65)	1.64 (.59)	- .81	.42
	WD:	91	1.89 (.72)	2.27 (.80)	-4.51	<.01*

TABLE III-12 continued

Grade	Residency Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Reading Effort	DA:	81	2.77 (.99)	2.89 (.94)	-1.56	.12
	DR:	98	1.92 (.83)	2.32 (1.02)	-5.41	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.85 (.93)	2.92 (1.11)	- .57	.57
	VA:	36	1.83 (.66)	2.14 (.83)	-2.14	.04*
	WD:	91	2.54 (.92)	2.93 (.90)	-4.41	<.01*
Written Composition Achievement	DA:	81	2.31 (.80)	2.51 (.91)	-3.19	<.01*
	DR:	98	1.56 (.72)	1.87 (.82)	-4.36	<.01*
	MU:	39	1.85 (.90)	2.21 (1.03)	-3.84	<.01*
	VA:	36	1.47 (.56)	1.69 (.62)	-2.26	.03*
	WD:	91	1.90 (.83)	3.33 (.90)	-4.13	<.01*
Written Composition Effort	DA:	84	2.80 (.92)	2.93 (.98)	-1.49	.14
	DR:	98	1.87 (.81)	2.20 (1.02)	-4.65	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.46 (1.02)	2.82 (1.02)	-2.21	.03*
	VA:	36	1.89 (.71)	2.08 (.87)	-1.36	.18
	WD:	86	2.73 (1.01)	2.90 (.84)	-1.50	.14
Spelling Achievement	DA:	80	2.70 (.97)	2.83 (1.08)	-1.79	.08
	DR:	98	1.73 (.74)	2.02 (.94)	-3.79	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.28 (1.26)	2.51 (1.34)	-1.78	.08
	VA:	36	1.33 (.54)	1.78 (.90)	-3.16	<.01*
	WD:	91	2.21 (1.14)	2.69 (1.06)	-5.52	<.01*
Spelling Effort	DA:	83	2.93 (.96)	3.05 (.97)	-1.56	<.12
	DR:	97	1.99 (.81)	2.24 (1.03)	-3.25	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.69 (1.15)	2.82 (1.34)	- .93	.36
	VA:	36	1.58 (.60)	1.92 (.87)	-2.16	.04*
	WD:	86	2.77 (1.17)	3.30 (.90)	-5.07	<.01*

TABLE III-12 continued

Grade	Residency Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Handwriting Achievement	DA:	83	2.51 (.80)	2.51 (.85)	.00	1.00
	DR:	98	1.85 (.66)	2.23 (.82)	-5.62	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.56 (.88)	2.72 (.76)	-1.23	.23
	VA:	36	1.72 (.62)	1.86 (.59)	-1.96	.05*
	WD:	91	2.19 (.89)	2.45 (.86)	-3.53	<.01*
Handwriting Effort	DA:	88	2.72 (.86)	2.85 (.89)	-2.10	<.04*
	DR:	98	2.03 (.70)	2.52 (.84)	-6.47	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.82 (.97)	2.79 (.77)	.18	<.86
	VA:	36	1.92 (.77)	2.11 (.92)	-1.56	.13
	WD:	87	2.48 (.89)	2.84 (.90)	-3.32	<.01*
Oral Language Achievement	DA:	82	2.55 (.69)	2.76 (.78)	-3.83	<.01*
	DR:	98	1.97 (.49)	2.32 (.71)	-4.77	<.01*
	MU:	40	2.93 (.83)	3.25 (.87)	-3.59	<.01*
	VA:	32	1.69 (.54)	1.69 (.47)	.00	1.00
	WD:	89	2.60 (.79)	2.66 (.83)	-.97	.33
Oral Language Effort	DA:	84	2.82 (.78)	3.00 (.86)	-2.47	.01*
	DR:	98	2.12 (.63)	2.45 (.75)	-4.62	<.01*
	MU:	40	3.08 (.80)	3.30 (.88)	-2.16	.04*
	VA:	32	1.97 (.78)	2.23 (1.04)	-1.97	.05*
	WD:	90	2.79 (.81)	3.00 (.84)	-2.60	.01*
English as a Second Language Achievement	DA:	16	2.44 (.63)	2.81 (.66)	-3.00	<.01*
	DR:	25	1.84 (.55)	2.00 (.50)	-1.69	.10
	MU:	26	2.85 (.93)	2.96 (.87)	-1.81	.08
	VA:	16	1.94 (.25)	2.50 (.63)	-3.58	<.01*
	WD:	8	2.38 (.52)	2.88 (.84)	-1.87	.10
English as a Second Language Effort	DA:	16	2.94 (.77)	3.19 (.83)	-2.24	.04*
	DR:	35	2.57 (1.04)	2.69 (.99)	-1.67	.10
	MU:	26	3.08 (.85)	3.23 (.77)	-1.44	.16
	VA:	16	2.56 (.73)	3.38 (.72)	-3.90	<.01*
	WD:	12	2.75 (.45)	2.92 (.67)	-1.00	.34

TABLE III-12 continued

Grade	Residency Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Mathematics Achievement	DA:	88	2.63 (.88)	2.53 (.99)	1.13	.26
	DR:	84	1.67 (.70)	1.89 (.78)	-3.04	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.21 (.92)	2.51 (1.05)	-2.93	<.01*
	VA:	36	1.64 (.49)	1.83 (.61)	-1.87	.07
	WD:	96	2.25 (.93)	2.31 (1.00)	- .80	.43
Mathematics Effort	DA:	88	3.02 (.84)	3.03 (.96)	- .13	.90
	DR:	85	2.05 (.75)	2.15 (.84)	-1.45	.15
	MU:	39	2.95 (.89)	2.97 (1.11)	- .18	.86
	VA:	36	1.86 (.64)	2.17 (.94)	-2.33	.02*
	WD:	96	2.96 (.94)	2.92 (1.02)	.41	.68
Science Achievement	DA:	88	2.35 (.64)	2.38 (.86)	- .54	.59
	DR:	85	1.84 (.48)	2.05 (.62)	-3.64	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.74 (.88)	2.87 (1.01)	-1.09	.28
	VA:	36	1.89 (.32)	2.08 (.81)	-1.42	.17
	WD:	96	1.77 (.62)	2.07 (.86)	-3.92	<.01*
Science Effort	DA:	88	2.69 (.81)	2.86 (.94)	-2.06	.04*
	DR:	85	1.99 (.61)	2.27 (.76)	-4.27	<.01*
	MU:	39	3.00 (.97)	3.03 (.99)	- .21	.84
	VA:	36	2.03 (.45)	2.31 (.67)	-2.38	.02*
	WD:	95	2.46 (.84)	2.65 (.85)	-1.99	.05*
Social Studies Achievement	DA:	88	2.47 (.68)	2.49 (.80)	- .34	.73
	DR:	85	1.86 (.47)	2.11 (.66)	-4.11	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.69 (.83)	2.82 (1.00)	-1.15	.26
	VA:	36	1.86 (.42)	2.06 (.48)	-2.91	<.01*
	WD:	95	1.86 (.78)	2.02 (.77)	-2.10	.04*
Social Studies Effort	DA:	88	2.90 (.80)	2.92 (.94)	- .29	.78
	DR:	98	2.09 (.59)	2.30 (.80)	-3.42	<.01*
	MU:	39	3.00 (.97)	3.03 (.99)	- .21	.84
	VA:	36	1.92 (.44)	2.17 (.66)	-3.00	<.01*
	WD:	94	2.49 (.84)	2.69 (.80)	-2.42	.02*

TABLE III-12 continued

Grade	Residency Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Health Education Achievement	DA:	88	2.57 (.71)	2.77 (.88)	-3.63	<.01*
	DR:	97	1.98 (.20)	2.12 (.42)	-3.28	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.74 (.88)	3.08 (.96)	-2.40	.02*
	VA:	36	1.97 (.29)	2.06 (.48)	-1.00	.32
	WD:	96	2.21 (.56)	2.43 (.78)	-2.73	<.01*
Health Education Effort	DA:	88	2.91 (.81)	3.11 (.88)	-3.36	<.01*
	DR:	98	2.10 (.37)	2.24 (.63)	-2.46	.01*
	MU:	39	3.00 (.97)	3.21 (.92)	-1.48	.15
	VA:	36	1.97 (.29)	2.17 (.61)	-2.22	.03*
	WD:	96	2.36 (.62)	2.73 (.76)	-5.23	<.01*
Music Achievement	DA:	88	2.65 (.85)	2.99 (.82)	-6.12	<.01*
	DR:	98	2.18 (.42)	2.29 (.52)	-2.41	.02*
	MU:	39	2.87 (.73)	3.46 (.68)	-6.71	<.01*
	VA:	36	2.03 (.17)	2.11 (.32)	-1.78	.08
	WD:	95	2.57 (.54)	2.96 (.77)	-5.51	<.01*
Music Effort	DA:	88	3.06 (.91)	3.30 (.87)	-3.95	<.01*
	DR:	99	2.21 (.46)	2.36 (.63)	-3.28	<.01*
	MU:	39	2.92 (.74)	3.51 (.64)	-6.71	<.01*
	VA:	36	2.14 (.42)	2.25 (.50)	-1.16	.25
	WD:	95	2.71 (.63)	3.02 (.80)	-4.69	<.01*
Art Achievement	DA:	88	3.08 (.68)	3.19 (.77)	-2.58	.01*
	DR:	98	2.17 (.41)	2.33 (.57)	-3.28	<.01*
	MU:	39	3.08 (.77)	3.46 (.64)	-4.42	<.01*
	VA:	36	1.81 (.58)	1.94 (.53)	-2.38	.02*
	WD:	96	2.61 (.64)	2.94 (.77)	-4.02	<.01*
Art Effort	DA:	88	3.41 (.71)	3.51 (.71)	-1.90	.06
	DR:	99	2.27 (.51)	2.51 (.77)	-3.73	<.01*
	MU:	39	3.18 (.76)	3.46 (.64)	-3.15	<.01*
	VA:	36	2.06 (.67)	2.25 (.87)	-1.75	.09
	WD:	94	2.96 (.72)	3.29 (.77)	-3.89	<.01*

TABLE III-12 continued

Grade	Residency Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Physical Education Achievement	DA:	88	2.75 (.85)	2.90 (.85)	-2.82	<.01*
	DR:	99	2.11 (.38)	2.23 (.55)	-2.51	.01*
	MU:	39	3.18 (.89)	3.49 (.76)	-3.13	<.01*
	VA:	35	1.97 (.30)	2.11 (.32)	-2.38	.02*
	WD:	96	2.73 (.49)	3.13 (.64)	-6.22	<.01*
Physical Education Effort	DA:	88	3.07 (.88)	3.23 (.85)	-2.40	.02*
	DR:	99	2.20 (.52)	2.38 (.78)	-2.74	<.01*
	MU:	39	3.23 (.90)	3.49 (.76)	-2.51	.02*
	VA:	36	2.00 (.41)	2.31 (.53)	-3.92	<.01*
	WD:	96	2.90 (.53)	3.31 (.67)	-6.89	<.01*
Listens to/Follows Directions	DA:	89	2.39 (.98)	2.48 (.93)	-1.38	.17
	DR:	98	1.74 (.80)	1.86 (.83)	-1.59	.12
	MU:	39	2.44 (1.00)	2.69 (1.13)	-1.66	.11
	VA:	37	1.49 (.65)	1.81 (.74)	-3.15	<.01*
	WD:	95	2.21 (.86)	2.52 (.86)	-3.94	<.01*
Finishes Work on Time	DA:	89	2.43 (1.05)	2.46 (.98)	- .45	.66
	DR:	98	1.92 (.86)	2.11 (.90)	-2.61	.01*
	MU:	39	2.82 (1.02)	2.87 (1.17)	- .44	.66
	VA:	37	1.54 (.65)	1.92 (.17)	-3.19	<.01*
	WD:	96	2.26 (.90)	2.68 (.85)	-4.27	<.01*
Keeps Own Materials in Order	DA:	89	2.75 (.87)	2.65 (.87)	1.97	.05*
	DR:	98	2.07 (.81)	2.25 (.82)	-2.72	<.01
	MU:	39	3.10 (.75)	3.33 (.81)	-2.69	.01*
	VA:	37	1.92 (.49)	2.35 (.86)	-4.06	<.01*
	WD:	96	2.59 (.82)	2.84 (.79)	-3.38	<.01*
Is Dependable	DA:	89	2.65 (.88)	2.76 (.88)	-1.83	.07
	DR:	98	2.16 (.88)	2.28 (.93)	-1.83	.07
	MU:	39	2.95 (.69)	3.18 (.91)	-1.94	.06
	VA:	37	1.89 (.61)	2.19 (.88)	-2.44	.02*
	WD:	96	2.58 (.90)	2.74 (.89)	-2.28	.02*

TABLE III-12 continued

Grade	Residency Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Assumes Responsibility for Actions	DA:	89	2.66 (.88)	2.71 (.99)	- .79	.43
	DR:	97	2.08 (.76)	2.17 (.87)	-1.12	.26
	MU:	39	2.82 (.94)	3.15 (1.04)	-2.82	<.01*
	VA:	37	1.73 (.51)	2.22 (.89)	-4.28	<.01*
	WD:	96	2.55 (.89)	2.74 (.82)	-2.94	<.01*
Works/Plays well with Others	DA:	88	2.81 (.84)	2.81 (.91)	- .12	.91
	DR:	97	2.08 (.75)	2.20 (.78)	-1.65	.10
	MU:	39	2.59 (.97)	2.72 (1.10)	-1.04	.30
	VA:	37	1.86 (.54)	2.08 (.83)	-1.96	.05*
	WD:	96	2.65 (.88)	2.77 (.86)	-2.21	.03*
Respects Rights/Property of Others	DA:	89	2.93 (.90)	2.96 (.89)	- .88	.38
	DR:	98	2.11 (.75)	2.24 (.82)	-1.88	.06
	MU:	39	2.77 (.96)	2.97 (1.09)	-1.48	.15
	VA:	37	1.92 (.60)	2.16 (.87)	-2.17	.04*
	WD:	96	2.66 (.86)	2.80 (.78)	-2.61	.01*
Is Courteous	DA:	89	2.88 (.89)	2.88 (.90)	.00	1.00
	DR:	98	2.13 (.80)	2.18 (.74)	- .81	.42
	MU:	39	2.97 (1.01)	3.10 (1.14)	-1.04	.30
	VA:	37	1.92 (.72)	2.27 (.65)	-3.97	<.01*
	WD:	96	2.72 (.91)	2.78 (.86)	- .92	.36
Obeys School Rules	DA:	89	2.72 (.91)	2.76 (.94)	- .60	.55
	DR:	98	2.10 (.75)	2.27 (.82)	-2.61	.01*
	MU:	39	2.87 (.73)	2.95 (.89)	- .77	.45
	VA:	37	1.86 (.59)	2.14 (.71)	-2.93	<.01*
	WD:	96	2.65 (.84)	2.82 (.81)	-2.45	.01*

Table III-13

Pre-Residency and Post-Residency Comparisons (t-tests), Mean Grades, and Standard Deviations **by Special Populations** (class types)

Key: A= Students in class(es) targeted at Asian speakers
SP=Students in class(es) targeted at Spanish speakers
B= Students in Bilingual Education
C= Students in Combination classes (i.e., more than one grade per classroom)
t=a value yielded by a statistical procedure (t-test) that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two means. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p.
p=the probability that the difference represented by t is due to chance.

M=Mean
S=Standard Deviation
n=number of valid cases; used to calculate M, & S

*=t represents a statistically significant difference ($p \leq .05$)

4.00=A or Outstanding
3.5=Excellent
3.00=B or Good
2.00=C or Satisfactory
1.00=D or Less than Satisfactory/Needs to Improve
0.00=F or Unsatisfactory

Grade	Class Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Reading Achievement	A:	23	2.22 (.74)	2.43 (.59)	-2.01	.05*
	SP:	43	2.35 (.78)	2.51 (.86)	-1.64	.11
	B:	14	1.64 (.63)	1.86 (.77)	-1.88	.08
	C:	90	1.87 (.84)	2.23 (.92)	-5.55	<.01*
Reading Effort	A:	23	2.61 (.84)	2.87 (.76)	-1.82	.08
	SP:	43	2.84 (.79)	2.84 (.87)	.00	1.00
	B:	14	2.00 (.39)	2.36 (.75)	-1.79	.10
	C:	93	2.46 (1.01)	2.86 (.99)	-4.66	<.01*

TABLE III-13 continued

Grade	Class Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Written Composition Achievement	A:	23	2.39 (.78)	2.78 (.67)	-2.86	<.01*
	SP:	45	2.36 (.77)	2.49 (.90)	-1.29	.20
	B:	14	1.29 (.61)	2.07 (.62)	-3.67	<.01*
	C:	90	1.89 (.77)	2.30 (.84)	-5.02	<.01*
Written Composition Effort	A:	22	2.86 (.77)	2.95 (.65)	- .62	.54
	SP:	45	2.80 (.82)	2.84 (.88)	- .42	.68
	B:	14	1.79 (.58)	2.64 (.63)	-4.84	<.01*
	C:	89	2.49 (1.00)	2.90 (1.02)	-3.92	<.01*
Spelling Achievement	A:	23	2.74 (1.21)	3.04 (.98)	-2.30	.03*
	SP:	45	2.67 (1.00)	2.96 (1.02)	-2.93	<.01*
	B:	14	1.57 (.76)	2.07 (.48)	-2.46	.03*
	C:	90	2.11 (1.02)	2.40 (1.06)	-3.71	<.01*
Spelling Effort	A:	23	3.13 (1.10)	3.35 (.94)	-1.31	.20
	SP:	45	2.96 (. 93)	3.22 (.12)	-2.60	.01*
	B:	14	1.79 (.43)	2.43 (.65)	-2.86	.01*
	C:	86	2.56 (1.05)	2.93 (1.02)	-3.51	<.01*
Handwriting Achievement	A:	23	2.70 (.88)	2.65 (.94)	.37	.71
	SP:	45	2.69 (.90)	2.67 (.93)	.20	.84
	B:	14	1.50 (.65)	2.07 (.62)	-4.16	<.01*
	C:	92	1.95 (.75)	2.34 (.82)	-5.17	<.01*
Handwriting Effort	A:	22	2.82 (.73)	2.91 (1.07)	- .57	.58
	SP:	45	2.93 (.81)	2.78 (.93)	1.42	.16
	B:	14	1.71 (.47)	2.86 (.66)	-8.00	<.01*
	C:	92	2.32 (.88)	2.85 (.90)	-5.56	<.01*
Oral Language Achievement	A:	23	2.52 (.67)	2.65 (.65)	-1.37	.19
	SP:	43	2.79 (.71)	2.93 (.80)	-1.96	.05*
	B:	14	1.86 (. 36)	2.50 (.52)	-3.80	<.01*
	C:	91	2.29 (. 69)	2.57 (.83)	-3.12	<.01*

TABLE III-13 continued

Grade	Class Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Oral Language Effort	A:	23	2.57 (.73)	2.78 (.74)	-1.55	.14
	SP:	45	3.00 (.71)	3.04 (.82)	- .53	.60
	B:	14	1.86 (.36)	2.71 (.47)	-4.84	<.01*
	C:	92	2.63 (.79)	3.01 (.88)	-3.95	<.01*
English as a Second Language Achievement	A:	4	2.50 (.58)	2.50 (.58)	.00	1.00
	SP:	14	2.36 (.50)	2.86 (.66)	-2.88	.01*
	B:	14	1.79 (.43)	2.00 (.39)	-1.88	.08
	C:	4	2.50 (1.00)	2.75 (.96)	-1.00	.39
English as a Second Language Effort	A:	4	2.50 (.58)	2.50 (.58)	.00	1.00
	SP:	18	2.83 (.51)	3.11 (.76)	-2.05	.05*
	B:	14	1.86 (.36)	2.21 (.58)	-2.69	.02*
	C:	4	3.25 (.96)	3.25 (.96)	.00	1.00
Mathematics Achievement	A:	27	2.41 (1.01)	2.56 (1.05)	-1.16	.26
	SP:	45	2.93 (.94)	2.62 (1.03)	2.54	.01*
	B:	13	1.46 (.52)	1.62 (.65)	-1.00	.34
	C:	95	2.25 (.83)	2.48 (.93)	-2.68	<.01*
Mathematics Effort	A:	27	2.93 (.96)	3.07 (.87)	-1.00	.33
	SP:	45	3.24 (.68)	2.98 (1.03)	2.14	.04*
	B:	14	1.93 (.62)	2.07 (.73)	-1.00	.34
	C:	95	2.79 (.87)	2.96 (.98)	-1.86	.06
Science Achievement	A:	27	1.74 (.66)	2.30 (.72)	-5.00	<.01*
	SP:	45	2.47 (.66)	2.47 (.79)	.00	1.00
	B:	14	1.71 (.47)	2.07 (.73)	-1.59	.14
	C:	95	2.06 (.60)	2.32 (.84)	-3.52	<.01*
Science Effort	A:	26	2.31 (.84)	2.73 (.67)	-3.07	<.01*
	SP:	45	2.69 (.67)	2.69 (.82)	.00	1.00
	B:	14	2.00 (.56)	2.36 (.63)	-2.69	.02*
	C:	95	2.51 (.81)	2.93 (.95)	-4.86	<.01*

TABLE III-13 continued

Grade	Class Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Social Studies Achievement	A:	27	1.96 (.85)	2.22 (.75)	-2.27	.03*
	SP:	45	2.58 (.66)	2.56 (.79)	.22	.83
	B:	14	1.86 (.36)	2.14 (.54)	-2.28	.04*
	C:	94	2.13 (.72)	2.39 (.75)	-3.26	<.01*
Social Studies Effort	A:	26	2.54 (.91)	2.69 (.74)	-1.07	.29
	SP:	45	2.82 (.68)	2.78 (.82)	.47	.64
	B:	14	2.00 (.56)	2.21 (.58)	-1.38	.19
	C:	95	2.68 (.87)	2.91 (.98)	-2.36	.02*
Health Education Achievement	A:	27	2.37 (.49)	2.74 (.45)	-3.91	<.01*
	SP:	45	2.67 (.85)	3.02 (.94)	-4.18	<.01*
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	2.00 (.00)	-1.00	.34
	C:	94	2.24 (.52)	2.50 (.73)	-3.78	<.01*
Health Education Effort	A:	27	2.48 (.64)	2.85 (.60)	-3.91	<.01*
	SP:	45	2.82 (.81)	3.07 (.92)	-2.88	<.01*
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	2.00 (.00)	-1.00	.34
	C:	95	2.56 (.74)	2.97 (.86)	-5.33	<.01*
Music Achievement	A:	26	2.69 (.47)	2.73 (.45)	-1.00	.33
	SP:	45	3.04 (.95)	3.18 (. 96)	-2.21	.03*
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	2.00 (.00)	-1.00	.34
	C:	95	2.34 (.52)	2.97 (.86)	-8.61	<.01*
Music Effort	A:	26	2.77 (.59)	2.88 (.65)	-1.81	.08
	SP:	45	3.16 (.98)	3.20 (.97)	- .70	.49
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	2.00 (.00)	-1.00	.34
	C:	96	2.65 (.75)	3.22 (.90)	-7.48	<.01*
Art Achievement	A:	27	2.81 (.83)	3.15 (.72)	-2.79	.01*
	SP:	45	3.18 (.86)	3.29 (.92)	-1.53	.13
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	2.00 (.00)	-1.00	.34
	C:	95	2.58 (.58)	3.01 (.69)	-6.35	<.01*

TABLE III-13 continued

Grade	Class Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Art Effort	A:	26	3.15 (.97)	3.42 (.70)	-1.77	.09
	SP:	44	3.45 (.70)	3.45 (.79)	.00	1.00
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	2.00 (.00)	-1.00	.34
	C:	96	2.96 (.75)	3.48 (.77)	-5.95	<.01*
Physical Education Achievement	A:	27	2.96 (.34)	3.22 (.51)	-3.02	<.01*
	SP:	45	3.24 (.80)	3.44 (.79)	-2.28	.03*
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	1.93 (.27)	.00	1.00
	C:	96	2.40 (.52)	2.80 (.73)	-5.77	<.01*
Physical Education Effort	A:	27	3.19 (.48)	3.63 (.49)	-4.56	<.01*
	SP:	45	3.36 (.71)	3.47 (.76)	-1.53	.13
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	1.86 (.36)	1.00	.34
	C:	96	2.66 (.72)	3.15 (.86)	-5.84	<.01*
Listens to/Follows Directions	A:	26	2.54 (.97)	2.60 (.98)	- .41	.68
	SP:	45	2.38 (.84)	2.33 (.89)	.51	.61
	B:	14	1.36 (.50)	1.36 (.50)	.00	1.00
	C:	96	2.13 (.91)	2.44 (.89)	-4.06	<.01*
Finishes Work on Time	A:	27	2.63 (.82)	3.02 (.78)	-2.79	.01*
	SP:	45	2.36 (.84)	2.26 (.91)	.92	.36
	B:	14	1.61 (.74)	1.75 (.70)	-1.00	.34
	C:	96	2.18 (1.01)	2.56 (.91)	-3.91	<.01*
Keeps Own Materials in Order	A:	27	2.63 (.82)	2.83 (.76)	-1.62	.12
	SP:	45	2.47 (.73)	2.47 (.79)	.00	1.00
	B:	14	1.96 (.57)	1.96 (.57)	.00	1.00
	C:	96	2.65 (.93)	2.77 (.85)	-1.47	.14
Is Dependable	A:	27	2.61 (.92)	2.83 (.76)	-1.51	.14
	SP:	45	2.44 (.82)	2.53 (.82)	-1.48	.15
	B:	14	2.04 (.50)	1.96 (.57)	1.00	.34
	C:	96	2.76 (.85)	2.95 (.82)	-2.76	<.01*

TABLE III-13 continued

Grade	Class Type	n	Pre M (S)	Post M (S)	t	p
Assumes Responsibility for Actions	A:	27	2.52 (.96)	2.74 (.83)	-1.80	.08
	SP:	45	2.41 (.81)	2.38 (.89)	.44	.66
	B:	14	1.96 (.57)	1.96 (.57)	.00	1.00
	C:	96	2.65 (.91)	2.91 (.90)	-3.27	<.01*
Works/Plays well with Others	A:	27	2.46 (.94)	2.70 (.88)	-1.87	.07
	SP:	45	2.56 (.79)	2.57 (.82)	- .22	.83
	B:	14	1.86 (.36)	1.86 (.36)	.00	1.00
	C:	95	2.79 (.87)	2.86 (.90)	- .97	.33
Respects Rights/Property of Others	A:	27	2.57 (.81)	2.83 (.76)	-1.93	.07
	SP:	45	2.43 (.78)	2.49 (.77)	-1.09	.28
	B:	14	2.00 (.00)	1.93 (.27)	1.00	.34
	C:	96	2.89 (.97)	3.02 (.85)	-2.27	.02*
Is Courteous	A:	27	2.74 (.83)	2.83 (.76)	- .71	.49
	SP:	45	2.64 (.77)	2.57 (.82)	1.19	.24
	B:	14	1.96 (.57)	2.04 (.50)	-1.00	.34
	C:	96	2.78 (1.00)	2.84 (.91)	- .86	.39
Obeys School Rules	A:	27	2.70 (.88)	2.83 (.76)	-1.19	.24
	SP:	45	2.37 (.80)	2.42 (.85)	- .93	.36
	B:	14	1.93 (.27)	1.93 (.27)	.00	1.00
	C:	96	2.71 (.87)	2.84 (.88)	-1.84	.07

Table III-14

Pre and During Residency **Attendance** Comparisons (t-tests), of Mean Proportion (%) of Days Present, Absent, and Tardy for **All Students Combined**

Key: n=number of valid cases; used to calculate M, S, and t
M=Average (mean) percent of days present/absent/tardy
S=Standard Deviation
t=a value yielded by a statistical procedure (t-test) that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two means. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p.
p=the probability that the difference represented by t is due to chance.
*=t represents a statistically significant difference at $p \leq .05$

Attendance Status	n	Pre-Residency M(S)*	During-Residency M(S)*	t	p
Proportion of days present	329	.91 (.19)	.91 (.11)	.29	.77
Proportion of days absent	327	.05 (.07)	.06 (.08)	- 3.32	<.01*
Proportion of days tardy	324	.01 (.03)	.02 (.05)	- 2.48	.01*

* Proportions do not total to 1.00 due to rounding error and to non-school days such as holidays. For example, the average proportion of non-school days during the Pre-Residency period was .03. Therefore, the total proportion of days present, days absent, and non-school days equal 1.00

Table III-15

Attendance/Tardy Comparisons (t-tests), of Mean Proportion (%) of Days Present, Absent, and Tardy for Workshop Days Versus Non-Workshop days During the Residency Periods for **All Students Combined.**

Key: n=number of valid cases; used to calculate M, S, and t
M=Average (mean) percent of days present/absent/tardy
S=Standard Deviation
t=a value yielded by a statistical procedure (t-test) that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two means. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p.
p=the probability that the difference represented by t is due to chance.
*=t represents a statistically significant difference at $p \leq .05$

Attendance Status	n	Workshop* Days M(S)	Non-Workshop* Days M(S)	t	p
Proportion of days present	550	.93 (.11)	.93 (.09)	.48	.63
Proportion of days absent	550	.05 (.09)	.06 (.09)	-1.12	.26
Proportion of days tardy	550	.02 (.07)	.02 (.04)	.72	.47

* Proportions do not total to 1.00 due to rounding error and to non-school days such as holidays. For example, the average proportion of non-school days across the Various Residencies was .02. Therefore, the total proportion of days present, days absent, and non-school days equal 1.00.

Table III-16

Pre-Residency and Post-Residency Comparisons (t-tests), Means, and Standard Deviations for Writing Analyses Items, Item Clusters, and Domains

Key: n=number of valid cases; used to calculate M, S, & t
t=a value yielded by a statistical procedure (t-test) that is used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between two means. The significance of t is interpreted in terms of p.
p=the probability that the difference represented by t is due to chance.
*=t value is statistically significant at $p \leq .05$
M=Mean
S=Standard Deviation

NOTES: 1) Cluster and Domain scores are weighted combinations of Item Scores.

2) Scales are not equivalent across items, clusters, or domains; hence, vertical comparisons are inappropriate.

Item/Cluster/Domain	n	t	p		Pre	Post
Item 1: Factual Knowledge	37	.37	.71	M:	.46	.41
				S:	.61	.64
Item 2: Skills	37	-1.15	.26	M:	1.81	2.11
				S:	1.20	1.13
Cluster 1-2=Domain 1-2: Cognitive Knowledge/Skills	37	- .87	.39	M:	.25	.28
				S:	.15	.16
Item 3: Clarity	37	- .25	.81	M:	.26	.26
				S:	.16	.15
Item 4: Main Idea	37	- .12	.90	M:	2.11	.97
				S:	2.14	.79
Item 5: Components	37	-1.41	.17	M:	2.05	2.41
				S:	1.15	.93
Cluster 4-5: Focus	37	- .80	.43	M:	.69	.75
				S:	.34	.26

Table III-16 continued

Item/Cluster/Domain	n	t	p		Pre	Post
Cluster 3-5: Expressive Communication	37	- .92	.37	M:	.55	.59
				S:	.22	.17
Item 6: Receptive Communication	37	-2.22	.03*	M:	1.68	2.19
				S:	1.06	.88
Domain 3-6: Communication	37	-1.56	.13	M:	.91	1.01
				S:	.31	.28
Item 7: Creative twist	37	-1.00	.32	M:	.05	.11
				S:	.23	.32
Item 8: Problem-solving	37	- .10	.92	M:	2.00	2.03
				S:	1.29	1.19
Cluster 7-8=Domain 7-8: Higher Order Skills	37	- .29	.77	M:	.41	.43
				S:	.26	.24
Item 9: Tone	17	-4.31	<.01*	M:	.59	1.53
				S:	.80	.51
Item 10: Fluency (confidence)	37	-5.56	<.01*	M:	2.59	3.65
				S:	.93	1.09
Item 11: Pride	37	<.00	>.99	M:	2.30	2.30
				S:	.74	.78
Domain 9-11: Self-Attitudes	17	-6.14	<.01*	M:	.49	.70
				S:	.16	.12
Item 12: Social Awareness	37	.57	.57	M:	.05	.03
				S:	.23	.16
Item 13: Cooperation	37	- .32	.75	M:	1.84	1.89
				S:	.76	.66
Item 14: Perspective	37	-1.75	.09	M:	1.38	1.59
				S:	.59	.55
Cluster 12-14=Domain 12-14: Socialization	37	-1.08	.29	M:	.54	.58
				S:	.17	.16

References

Brunk, V.N., & Denton, J.J. (1983). Evaluation of a sociomusic curriculum for young learners, Texas Tech Journal of Education, 10(1), 43-47.

Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1966). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Cohen, E.P., & Gainer, R.S. (1984). Art: Another language for learning, New York, NY: Schocken Books, 207-210.

Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Eisner, E.W. (1979). Cross-cultural research in arts education: Problems, issues, and prospects. Art in Education, 21(1), 27-35.

Eisner, E.W. (1972). Educating artistic vision. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Eisner, E.W. (1980). The role of the arts in the invention of man. In Arts in cultural diversity: A selection of papers presented at the 23rd world congress of the International Society for Education Through Art in conjunction with the 7th biennial assembly of the Australian Society. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Kindler, A.M. (1987). (1987). A review of rationales for integrated arts programs. The Journal of Issues and Research. 29(1), 52-59.

Krueger, R.A. (1986). Focus Group Interview: Step by step instruction. Division of Agriculture Education, Department of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Minnesota, St.Paul,MN.

McNemar, Q. (1969). Psychological statistics (fourth edition). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. (1975). Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd edition). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Quelmalz, E.S., & Burry, J. (1983). Analytic scales for assessing students' expository and narrative writing skills. CSE Resource Paper No. 5. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School or Education.

Redfield, D.L., Holt, J.L., & Martray, C.R. (1987). The Prose Quantification System for evaluating the creative quality of prose: A construct validation study. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 5, 67-75.

Steveni, M. (1968). Art and education. New York, NY: Atherton Press.

Yin, R.K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A

Compendium of Evaluation Strategies

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (grades 4-9)
Music Center Education Division
Artists-in-Residence Program

INSTRUCTIONS: On the lines below, write the name of your school, the grade you are in, and the name of the artist who has been working with your class.

School: ________________________________

Grade: ________________________________

Artist: ________________________________

INSTRUCTIONS: While your teacher reads each of the following items out loud, put an **X** on the line that best describes your opinion about each item. Since these items ask for your opinions, they do not have any right or wrong answers. Please answer each item as honestly as you can. When you are finished, your teacher will collect the questionnaires. Your teacher will not read the questionnaires. The questionnaires will be sealed in an envelope and given to The Music Center.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I enjoyed working with the artist.	___	___	___	___
2.	I have learned a lot from working with the artist.	___	___	___	___
3.	I use what I learned from the artist to help me with my other school work.	___	___	___	___
4.	I use what I learned from the artist to help me do things outside of school.	___	___	___	___
5.	The artist helped me feel like I can do anything if I try.	___	___	___	___
6.	I talk with my parents about the artist.	___	___	___	___
7.	I have always wanted to be an artist.	___	___	___	___
8.	I am thinking about becoming an artist.	___	___	___	___
9.	I wish we had more time to work with the artist.	___	___	___	___
10.	I would like to work with other artists.	___	___	___	___
11.	My teacher participated when the artist worked with our class.	___	___	___	___

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12. My teacher and the artist worked together to get ready for the artist's workshops with the class.	___	___	___	___
13. In our regular class work, my teacher uses examples from our workshops with the artist.	___	___	___	___
14. My teacher makes assignments that are related to what we learned from the artist.	___	___	___	___
15. The artist talks about things that are going on in my regular classroom.	___	___	___	___
16. I actively participated in the culminating event.	___	___	___	___
17. I enjoyed getting ready for the culminating event.	___	___	___	___
18. I felt that I could be successful with the activities we did with the Artist.	___	___	___	___
19. I asked the Artist a lot of questions.	___	___	___	___
20. Since working with the Artist, I have read books about the kinds of things the Artist taught us.	___	___	___	___
21. Since working with the Artist, I have asked my teacher for more information about the arts.	___	___	___	___
22. Since working with the Artist, I participate more in class.	___	___	___	___
23. Since working with the Artist, I get along better with other students.	___	___	___	___
24. Since working with the Artist, I help other students more.	___	___	___	___
25. I felt proud of myself when I participated in the classes taught by the Artist.	___	___	___	___
26. I tried hard to do a good job on the activities we did with the Artist.	___	___	___	___
27. Since working with the Artist, I try harder in school.	___	___	___	___
28. I understood what the artist expected of me.	___	___	___	___

Student Questionnaire 3

INSTRUCTIONS: You may use the space below to write comments about your experiences with the artist. We would especially like to know what you liked most about working with the artist, what you learned, how you felt, and any ideas you might have for improving the workshops.

THANK YOU!!

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
Music Center Education Division
Artists-in-Residence Program

INSTRUCTIONS: For purposes of evaluating the Artists-in-Residence Program, your responses will be combined with those of other participating teachers at numerous schools and will not be identifiable on an individual basis. When you have completed the form, please put it in a sealed envelope and give it to your Music Center-School Coordinator for submission to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting. **THANK YOU!**

1. Type of Residency (check one):

_____Dance
_____Drama
_____Music
_____Visual Arts
_____Writing
_____Other (specify):______________________________

2. Grade(s):__________

3. Approximate number of students in your class:__________

4. Including this year, this school has participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program for _____ years.,

5. Including this year, I have participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program for _____ years.

6. Number of student workshops in this residency (i.e., the number of times your students met with the artist): _____

7. Number of minutes per workshop: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an X on the appropriate line.

	All	Most	Few	None
8. During this residency, I was present at _____ of my students' workshops.	___	___	___	___
9. During this residency, I actively participated in _____ of the student workshops.	___	___	___	___
10. During this residency, the artist and I collaborated on _____ of the student workshops.	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an X on the appropriate line. (**SA**-Strongly Agree; **A**-Agree; **D**-Disagree; **SD**-Strongly Disagree; **N/A**-Does not apply, e.g., not scheduled; no opportunity to observe; etc.).

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
11.	My students learned the skills and cognitive knowledge taught by this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
12.	The knowledge and skills my students learned from this artist carried over into their regular classwork.	___	___	___	___	___
13.	My students increased their appreciation of the arts from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
14.	My students gained more positive attitudes about themselves from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
15.	My students gained more positive attitudes about school from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
16.	My students' behavior has improved as a result of working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
17.	My students enjoyed working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
18.	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers and artists collaborate.	___	___	___	___	___
19.	Our School-Residency Coordinator provided me with schedules and materials throughout the residency.	___	___	___	___	___
20.	I actively participated in the Planning/Orientation meeting(s).	___	___	___	___	___
21.	I actively participated in the Special Events (e.g., Teacher Workshops, Field Trips).	___	___	___	___	___
22.	I actively participated in the Final Evaluation meeting.	___	___	___	___	___
23.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the artist.	___	___	___	___	___
24.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
25.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s)	___	___	___	___	___
26.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency.	___	___	___	___	___
27.	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the artist.	___	___	___	___	___
28.	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___
29.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting.	___	___	___	___	___
30.	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies.	___	___	___	___	___
31.	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/ Products.	___	___	___	___	___
32.	The Culminating Event focused on the creative process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product.	___	___	___	___	___
33.	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate.	___	___	___	___	___
34.	My participation in the Teacher Workshops has or will benefit my students.	___	___	___	___	___
35.	My participation in Special Events (e.g. Field Trips, Performances) has or will benefit my students	___	___	___	___	___
36.	My students accurately executed workshop tasks and activities.	___	___	___	___	___
37.	My students shared outside-of-school experiences with me that were related to the Residency.	___	___	___	___	___
38.	Since working with the Artist, my students more accurately follow instructions.	___	___	___	___	___
39.	Since working with the Artist, my students participate more in class.	___	___	___	___	___

	SA	A	D	SD	N/A
40. Since working with the Artist, my students are more willing to express themselves (orally and written).	___	___	___	___	___
41. Since working the the Artist, my students are more cooperative in the classroom (e.g., get along better with their peers).	___	___	___	___	___
42. Since working with the Artist, my students are more cooperative outside of class (e.g., on the playground).	___	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS: Following is a list of things that may get in the way of implementing the best of all possible residencies. Based on your experience with this residency, rank order the list from the smallest problem (#1) to the biggest problem (#6 or 7, depending on whether you include "other") by writing the appropriate number on the line in front of each item. When you are finished, each line should have a different number or rank.

_____ Amount of time available for initial planning.
_____ Amount of time available for on-going, regular planning/evaluation.
_____ Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period).
_____ Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks).
_____ Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium).
_____ Scheduling (explain):______________________________
_____ Other (specify):__________________________________

Comments:

Please remember to put the completed form in a sealed envelope and give it to the School-Residency Coordinator for submission to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting. **THANK YOU!**

ARTIST QUESTIONNAIRE
Music Center Education Division
Artists-in-Residence Program

INSTRUCTIONS: **Please complete a separate form for each of your residencies.** For purposes of evaluating the Music Center's Artists-in-Residence Program, your responses will be combined with those of other Artists-in-Residence and will not be identifiable on an individual basis. Put the completed forms in a sealed envelope and give them to the School's Music Center Coordinator for submission to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting. **THANK YOU!**

1. Type of Residency (check one):

   _____Dance
   _____Drama
   _____Music
   _____Visual Arts
   _____Writing
   _____Other (specify):______________________________

2. Grade(s):__________

3. Approximate number of students served:__________

4. Including this year, I have participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program for _____ years.,

5. Including this year, I have participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program at this school for _____ years.

6. Number of student workshops in this residency: _____

7. Number of minutes per individual workshop: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an **X** on the appropriate line. (SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree; N/A=Does not apply, e.g., not scheduled; no opportunity to observe; etc.).

	SA	A	D	SD	N/A
8. During this residency, the participating teachers attended most of the student workshops.	___	___	___	___	___
9. The teachers actively participated in most of the student workshops.	___	___	___	___	___
10. The teachers and I collaborated in planning most of the student workshops.	___	___	___	___	___
11. Most of the workshop planning was initiated by teachers.	___	___	___	___	___

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
12.	I initiated most of the workshop planning.	___	___	___	___	___
13.	I frequently offered suggestions for classroom follow-up activities.	___	___	___	___	___
14.	The teachers usually used my suggestions for follow-up activity.	___	___	___	___	___
15.	The teachers often came up with follow-up activities on their own.	___	___	___	___	___
16.	I actively participated in the Planning/Orientation meeting(s).	___	___	___	___	___
17.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___
18.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___
19.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s).	___	___	___	___	___
20.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency.	___	___	___	___	___
21.	I actively participated in the Final Evaluation meeting.	___	___	___	___	___
22.	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___
23.	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___
24.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting.	___	___	___	___	___
25.	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies.	___	___	___	___	___
26.	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/Products.	___	___	___	___	___

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
27.	The Culminating Event Focused on the creative Process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product.	___	___	___	___	___
28.	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate.	___	___	___	___	___
29.	Teachers' participation in the Special Events (e.g.; Teacher Workshops) was such that it should benefit their students.	___	___	___	___	___
30.	The students learned the knowledge and skills that I taught.	___	___	___	___	___
31.	The workshop knowledge and skills learned by the students carried over from workshop to workshop.	___	___	___	___	___
32.	The workshop knowledge and skills learned by the students carried over into their regular classwork.	___	___	___	___	___
33.	The workshop knowledge and skills were reinforced in the regular classroom by the classroom teacher.	___	___	___	___	___
34.	As a result of this residency, the students increased their appreciation of the arts.	___	___	___	___	___
35.	The students' attitudes toward themselves and their work improved throughout the residency.	___	___	___	___	___
36.	The students' behavior has improved throughout the residency.	___	___	___	___	___
37.	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers and artists collaborate.	___	___	___	___	___
38.	Students shared outside-of-school experiences with me that were related to the Residency.	___	___	___	___	___
39.	Students shared classroom experiences with me that were related to the Residency.	___	___	___	___	___

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
40.	Students accurately executed activities based on the knowledge and skills presented in the workshops.	___	___	___	___	___
41.	Students demonstrated that they understood my instructions.	___	___	___	___	___
42.	Students were engaged (e.g., they maintained eye contact with me during instruction and focused their attention on workshop tasks).	___	___	___	___	___
43.	When appropriate, students worked cooperatively.	___	___	___	___	___
44.	Students showed pride in their accomplishments.	___	___	___	___	___
45.	Students took care with the activities.	___	___	___	___	___
46.	Students seemed to enjoy the workshops (e.g., often smiled).	___	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS: Following is a list of things that may get in the way of implementing the best of all possible residencies. Based on your experience with this residency, rank order the list from the biggest problem (#6 or 7, depending on whether you include "other") to the smallest problem (#1) by writing the appropriate number on the line in front of each item. When you are finished, each line should have a different number or rank.

_____ Amount of time available for initial, collaborative planning.

_____ Amount of time available for on-going, regular planning/evaluation.

_____ Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period).

_____ Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks).

_____ Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium).

_____ Scheduling (explain):______________________________

_____ Other (specify):__________________________________

Comments:

Please remember to put the completed form in a sealed envelope and give it to the School's Music Center Coordinator for submission to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting. **THANK YOU!**

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Music Center Education Division
Artists-in-Residence Program

INSTRUCTIONS: Welcome to the Culminating Event for your child's Artist-in-Residence program. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. Your answers will help the Music Center and the School provide quality arts education programs for students. Please turn in your completed questionnaire before you leave the program today. **THANK YOU** for your help.

1. School: ______________________________

2. Your Child's grade in School (Circle):

K 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3. Type of Program (Mark with an **X**):
   - ______ Dance
   - ______ Drama
   - ______ Music
   - ______ Visual Arts
   - ______ Writing
   - ______ Other (describe): ______________________________

4. This year, I have been to this school for the following reasons (Mark with an **X**):
   - ______ Parent-Teacher conference
   - ______ PTA meetings
   - ______ To help in the Office or my Child's Classroom
   - ______ To attend other special programs (e.g., Christmas)
   - ______ Other (describe): ______________________________

5. I am aware that my child has been working with an Artist-in Residence for the past few weeks (Mark with an **X**):
   - ______True
   - ______False

INSTRUCTIONS: For the following items, write an **X** on the line that best describes your opinion about each item.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
6.	My child often talks to me about the Artist-in-Residence.	__	__	__	__	__
7.	My child has enjoyed working with an Artist-in-Residence.	__	__	__	__	__
8.	My child looks forward to coming to school on the days the artist is there.	__	__	__	__	__

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
9.	At home, my child uses ideas or skills taught by the Artist-in-Residence.	___	___	___	___	___
10.	Working with an Artist-in-Residence helped improve the rest of my child's schoolwork.	___	___	___	___	___
11.	I would like my child to have more chances to work with an Artist-in-Residence.	___	___	___	___	___
12.	It is very important for the schools to teach the arts.	___	___	___	___	___
13.	My child feels good about what he/she accomplished while working with the Artist-in Residence.	___	___	___	___	___
14.	My child has always been interested in the arts.	___	___	___	___	___
15.	My child is now interested in the arts.	___	___	___	___	___
16.	My child wants to continue to be involved in the arts in the future.	___	___	___	___	___
17.	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child reads more about the arts.	___	___	___	___	___
18.	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child's homework has improved.	___	___	___	___	___
19.	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child's grades have improved.	___	___	___	___	___
20.	Since working with the Artist-in-Residence, my child does a better job of following instructions accurately.	___	___	___	___	___
21.	Since working with an Artist-in-Residence, my child gets along better with others.	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

Please return your completed questionnaire before leaving the program today.
THANK YOU!

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE
Music Center Education Division
Artists-in-Residence Program

INSTRUCTIONS: **Please complete a separate form for each residency.** For purposes of evaluating the Artists-in-Residence Program, your responses will be combined with those of other administrators and will not be identifiable on an individual basis. Put the completed form in a sealed envelope and give it to your School-Residency Coordinator for submission to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting. **THANK YOU!**

1. Type of Residency (check one):

_____Dance
_____Drama
_____Music
_____Visual Arts
_____Writing
_____Other (specify):________________________________

2. Grade(s):__________

3. Approximate number of students served:__________

4. Including this year, this school has participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program for _____ years.

5. Including this year, I have participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program for _____ years.

6. Number of workshops in this residency (i.e., number of times each class met with the artist): _____

7. Number of minutes per workshop: _____

8. During this residency, I was able to spend a total of approximately _____ minutes observing the student workshops (Check one):

_____ N/A (I was unable to do any observing)
_____ less than 30
_____ 30-60
_____ more than 60

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an **X** on the appropriate line. (**All**-the entire meeting; **Part**-less than the entire meeting; **None**-did not attend).

	All	Part	None
9. I attended _____ of the Orientation/ Planning Meeting(s) for this residency.	___	___	___
10. I attended _____ of the Special Events for this residency (e.g., teacher workshops, field trips, assemblies).	___	___	___

		All	Part	None
11.	I attended _____ of the Culmination Event for this residency.	___	___	___
12.	I attended _____ of the Evaluation Meeting for this residency.	___	___	___

13. I was available to facilitate ______of the scheduling associated with the Residency or provided a well-informed substitute.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an **X** on the appropriate line. (**SA**=Strongly Agree; **A**=Agree; **D**=Disagree; **SD**=Strongly Disagree; **N/A**=Does not apply or no opportunity to observe).

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
14.	The Music Center was timely in providing me, or the School-Residency Coordinator with all necessary residency schedules and materials.	___	___	___	___	___
15.	I, or the School-Residency Coordinator, was timely in providing the Music Center with schedule changes.	___	___	___	___	___
16.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the artist.	___	___	___	___	___
17.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___
18.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) were useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___
19.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s)	___	___	___	___	___
20.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency.	___	___	___	___	___
21.	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the artist.	___	___	___	___	___
22.	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___
23.	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___
24.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting.	___	___	___	___	___

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
25.	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies.	___	___	___	___	___
26.	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/ Products.	___	___	___	___	___
27.	The Culminating Event focused on the creative process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product.	___	___	___	___	___
28.	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate.	___	___	___	___	___
29.	All teachers at this school benefited by participating in Teacher Workshops presented by the Resident Artist).	___	___	___	___	___
30.	Teachers participating in the Residency benefited by participating in Special Events (e.g., Field Trips, performances).	___	___	___	___	___
31.	The students learned the cognitive knowledge and skills taught by this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
32.	The knowledge and skills the students learned from this artist carried over into their regular classwork.	___	___	___	___	___
33.	Students increased their appreciation of the arts from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
34.	Students gained more positive attitudes about themselves from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
35.	Students gained more positive attitudes about school from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
36.	Students' behavior has improved as a result of working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
37.	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers and artists collaborate.	___	___	___	___	___

	SA	A	D	SD	N/A
38. In this residency, teachers and artists truly collaborated.	___	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an **X** on the appropriate line.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
39. The artist's effectiveness with students was ______.	___	___	___	___
40. The artist's effectiveness with teachers was ______.	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS: Following is a list of things that may get in the way of implementing the best of all possible residencies. Based on your experience with this residency, rank order the list from the smallest problem (#1) to the biggest problem (#6 or 7, depending on whether you include "other") by writing the appropriate number on the line in front of each item. When you are finished, each line should have a different number or rank.

_____ Amount of time available for initial planning.
_____ Amount of time available for on-going, regular planning/evaluation.
_____ Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period).
_____ Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks).
_____ Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium).
_____ Scheduling (explain):_______________________________
_____ Other (specify):_________________________

COMMENTS:

Please remember to put the completed form in a sealed envelope and give it to the School-Music Center Coordinator for submission to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting. **THANK YOU!**

SCHOOL-RESIDENCY COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE
Music Center Education Division
Artists-in-Residence Program

INSTRUCTIONS: **Please complete a separate form for each residency that you coordinate.** For purposes of evaluating the Artists-in-Residence Program, your responses will be combined with those of other School-Residency Coordinators and will not be identifiable on an individual basis. Put the completed form in a sealed envelope and give it, along with the sealed evaluations you receive from others, to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting. **THANK YOU!**

1. My position at the school (check one):

   _____ Teacher participating in a Residency during 1989-90.
   _____ Teacher not participating in a Residency during 1989-90.
   _____ Principal
   _____ Assistant or Vice Principal
   _____ Other (specify): _________________________

2. Type of Residency (check one):

   _____ Dance
   _____ Drama
   _____ Music
   _____ Visual Arts
   _____ Writing
   _____ Other (specify): ___________________________________

3. Grade(s) participating in this residency: __________

4. Approximate number of students served by this residency: __________

5. Including this year, this school has participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program for _____ years.

6. Including this year, I have served as School-Residency Coordinator for _____ years.

7. Including this year, I have in some way participated in the Artists-in-Residence Program for _____ years.

8. Number of student workshops in this residency (i.e., number of times each class met with the artist): _____

9. Number of minutes per workshop: _____

10. During this residency, I was able to spend approximately _____ minutes observing student workshops (Check one):

    _____ N/A (e.g., I do not have a class or I was unable to do any observing).
    _____ less than 30
    _____ 30-60
    _____ more than 60

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an X on the appropriate line. (All=the entire meeting; Part=less than the entire meeting; None=did not attend).

		All	Part	None
11.	I attended _____ of the Orientation/ Planning Meeting(s) for this residency.	___	___	___
12.	I attended _____ of the Special Events for this residency (e.g., teacher workshops, field trips, assemblies).	___	___	___
13.	I attended _____ of the Culmination Event for this residency.	___	___	___
14.	I attended _____ of the Evaluation Meeting for this residency.	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following items by marking an X on the appropriate line. (SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree; N/A=Does not apply or no opportunity to observe).

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
15.	The Music Center was timely in providing me with all necessary residency schedules and materials.	___	___	___	___	___
16.	I was timely in providing the Music Center with Schedule changes.	___	___	___	___	___
17.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the artist.	___	___	___	___	___
18.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) seemed useful for the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___
19.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) were useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___
20.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Orientation/Planning meeting(s)	___	___	___	___	___
21.	The Orientation/Planning meeting(s) was/were important to the success of this residency.	___	___	___	___	___
22.	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the artist.	___	___	___	___	___
23.	The Final Evaluation meeting seemed useful for the teachers.	___	___	___	___	___
24.	The Final Evaluation meeting was useful to me.	___	___	___	___	___

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
25.	It was important for a Music Center Representative to be at the Final Evaluation meeting.	___	___	___	___	___
26.	The Final Evaluation meeting will contribute to the success of future residencies.	___	___	___	___	___
27.	The Culminating Event focused on final Outcomes/Performances/ Products.	___	___	___	___	___
28.	The Culminating Event ocused on the creative process rather than on rote and drill leading to a final polished performance or product.	___	___	___	___	___
29.	The focus of the Culminating Event (e.g., process vs. product) was appropriate.	___	___	___	___	___
30.	All teachers at this school benefited from the Teacher Workshop(s) presented by the Artist-in-Residence	___	___	___	___	___
31.	All teachers at this school benefited from the Special Events (e.g., Performances, Culminating Event),provided through the Artist-in-Residence.	___	___	___	___	___
32.	Teachers participating in the Residency benefited from the Special Events (e.g., Teacher Workshops, Field Trips) provided through the Artist-in-Residence.	___	___	___	___	___
33.	The students learned the cognitive knowledge and skills taught by this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
34.	The knowledge and skills the students learned from this artist carried over into their regular classwork.	___	___	___	___	___
35.	Students increased their appreciation of the arts from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
36.	Students gained more positive attitudes about themselves from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
37.	Students gained more positive attitudes about school from working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___

		SA	A	D	SD	N/A
38.	Students' behavior has improved as a result of working with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
39.	Students enjoyed their experiences with this artist.	___	___	___	___	___
40.	In order for students to maximally benefit from the Residencies, it is critical that teachers and artists collaborate.	___	___	___	___	___
41.	In this residency, teachers and artists truly collaborated.	___	___	___	___	___
42.	This artist worked effectively with the participating teachers.	___	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS: Following is a list of things that may get in the way of implementing the best of all possible residencies. Based on your experience with this residency, rank order the list from the smallest problem (#1) to the biggest problem (#6 or 7, depending on whether you include "other") by writing the appropriate number on the line in front of each item. When you are finished, each line should have a different number or rank.

_____ Amount of time available for initial planning.
_____ Amount of time available for on-going, regular planning/evaluation.
_____ Amount of time available for each of the student workshops (e.g., a class period).
_____ Amount of time available for the workshop series (e.g., 12 weeks).
_____ Appropriateness of the available facilities (e.g., classrooms, auditorium).
_____ Scheduling (explain):_______________________________
_____ Other (specify):_________________________________

COMMENTS:

Please remember to put the completed form in a sealed envelope and give it, along with the other sealed questionnaires you have collected, to Melinda Williams or Denise Grande at the Final Evaluation meeting.

THANK YOU!

Focus Group Interview (FGI) Protocol for Use With Junior High and High School Students Having Previous, Multiple Experiences with MCED Programs

Interview Materials

Nametags
Bold magic markers
Student Information Sheets (copy attached)
Pencils
Tape recorder
Blank audiotapes
Notepads for interviewer and backup

Pre-Interview Procedures

1. Arrange seats in a circle or around an oblong table. Assign seats by placing nametags in chairs. Make seating assignments so that the most vocal/aggressive interviewees are nearest the interviewer and so that the quietest, most withdrawn interviewees are across from the interviewer. So that everyone has opportunities to speak and so that numerous opinions are represented, groups should consist of from 8-12 interviewees. Information about the vocalness of the interviewees may be observed by the interviewers during an informal gathering prior to the interview or it may be obtained from knowledgeable school personnel (e.g., teachers, counselors, administrators).

2. Place the tape recorder so that all voices will be picked up.

3. Have interviewees take their seats and apply their nametags. The interviewer and assistant or "backup" Interviewer should do likewise. The interviewer should be seated with the interviewees in the circular arrangement; the backup should be seated unobtrusively behind and to the side of the circle.

4. Have students fill out the Information Sheets; collect completed sheets prior to beginning the interview.

Scripted Introduction to the Interview

(For research and evaluation purposes, the script should be read so that the interview administration is uniform or standard from group to group. Different scripts are required for interviews having different purposes).

"Thank you for being here today. My name is (interviewer's name). With me is (backup interviewer's name). We are working on a research project for the Music Center of Los Angeles County. As many of you know, the Music Center has brought a number of artists to the schools that you have attended. One purpose of the project that ___ and I are working on is to study how artists affect students and schools. We are doing this study because many people who work at the Music Center and in schools believe that artists can make important contributions to the education of students. So far, however, no one has adequately documented exactly what kinds of effects artists have on schools or how they may influence students.

In working on this project, it is important for us to talk with students; after all, you are the ones who work most closely with the artists in the schools. In fact, you were selected to participate in today's discussion with us because you have worked with more than one artist and, therefore, have more experience than some other students with regard to the issues we are studying.

Before we begin, I need to establish a few ground rules. First of all, we will be tape recording our discussion. However, the only person who may listen to the tape again is me. The only reason even I would listen to it is that I will not be taking any notes today and I may later want to remember something important that you said. Also, the tape will be destroyed when ___ and I finish our work on the project. Throughout our discussion today, ___ will be taking notes so that he/she can help me remember what was said. He/she and I will keep everything that you tell us today confidential and anonymous, so I hope that you will feel free to be perfectly frank. If your teachers or principal or anyone else ask us what we heard today, we will provide them only with general information regarding your overall opinions as a group. We will not name individuals and we will make sure that your anonymity and privacy are protected.

The only reason we have asked you to wear name tags is so that we don't need to point to one another. We have asked you to fill out an information sheet so that we know something about the characteristics of this group as a whole. Again, I want to emphasize that the information will remain anonymous and confidential.

Finally, it is important that everyone of you has an opportunity to express your opinion on each of the questions that I ask you. No one in the group, not even me, is to be considered the expert on anything that we talk about. Everyone's opinion is to be considered equally important. Also, we want to be careful not to judge one another's opinions. Each person is entitled to his or her own opinion.

Before we begin, do you have any questions?

Interview Questions

(Based on 12 interviewees and a, 45-minute period, limit each question and response period to 5 minutes. One of the backup's responsibilities is to keep the interviewer on task and on time).

1. It's possible to learn things from people who are not classroom teachers. Some of the things we learn from others are positive while others are not. We may learn facts or techniques or even attitudes or ways to think about things. What are some of the kinds of things you may have learned from the artists who have been in your classes?

2. Usually when we learn something from someone, we begin to notice changes in how we think or feel or do things. What are some changes you may have noticed in yourselves or others--such as your teachers or friends--since working with the artists?

3. How do you think these changes came about? For example, do you think that the changes that you've noticed in yourselves occured mostly because of 1) one particular artist that you

met only once or 2) because of one artist that you met with for several weeks, or 3) because of your experiences with several different artists?

4. Sometimes we feel or think or behave differently in different situations such as home and school or P.E. and math. What we would like to know about are some of the differences in how you felt or acted or thought about things while working with an artist compared to your regular classes. (Follow-up question: Do you have some ideas as to why?)."

5. The Music Center believes that the artists can do a better job in the schools if the teachers and artists work together. What do you think? (Follow up with "Why?" and probe for what artists and teachers do when they "work together.").

6. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your experiences with the artists before we go?

Again, THANK YOU for your time and your thoughtful responses!

Post Interview Procedures

(Items 1 and 2 below should be completed immediately following each interview. Steps 3 and 4 may occur off site but should be completed within a few days).

1. The interviewer and backup independently write their "impressions" of the group's overall response to each of the items. Impressions are not a tallying of facts; rather, they are meant to provide a sense of the "gestalt" of the group's responses. The backup may refer to notes taken during the interview but the interviewer must rely upon memory. Some items may raise individual responses that are critical and notable exceptions to the group's overall response. In such cases, exceptions may be included but they should be noted as such and not be misrepresented as majority opinions.

2. The interviewer and backup meet to discuss their impressions and reach concensus as to the group's overall response to each item.

3. The interviewer writes a summary of the concensus discussion.

4. The backup interviewer edits the concensus write-up for accuracy.

Focus Group Interview: Student Information Sheet

1. First Name:______________________________

2. Grade:______________________________

3. What do you plan to when you finish high school?

____

____

4. What do you hope to be doing 10 years after you finish high school?

____

____

5. In the spaces below, list each type of artist that you have met or worked with in school. Examples include dancer, musician, actor, writer, painter, etc. Next to each artist on your list, mark an **X** on the line that best describes how many times you met with the artist.

	Number of Meetings		
Type of Artist	1	2-5	more than 5
____________	___	___	___
____________	___	___	___
____________	___	___	___
____________	___	___	___
____________	___	___	___

Shadowing Protocol

Purpose: Systematically observe students for behavioral indicators of targeted outcomes, e.g., self-esteem.

Instructions: Select up to six students for observation. Focus on student #1 for one minute. Then, using the attached observation form, record what you observed.The number of times a behavior was observed is irrelevant. For example if a student volunteered to answer 6 questions during the one-minute period, the student simply receives credit for volunteering--volunteering once counts as much as volunteering six times. In cases where a student's behavior is not totally consistent throughout the one-minute period, record your overall observation. For example, if a student focuses on the task part of the time but is generally attending to something/someone else, do not assign credit for being focused. When you have finished recording your observations of student #1, focus on student #2 for one minute and subsequently record your observations. Continue in this manner until all targeted students have been observed once. Then, repeat the cycle until all targeted students have been observed three or more times. Use additional observation forms as necessary.

Contextual Information

School:____________ Observer:____________ Date:______________________
Begin Time:________ End Time:___________ Total Time:_________________
Type of lesson(e.g., math, residency workshop):_____________________________
Type of instructor (e.g., regular teacher, artist, substitute:_____________________
Lesson format (e.g., seatwork, lecture)_____________________________________
Task description/objective:____

Key

Use the following symbols to record your observations of the behaviors listed on the attached form. More than one of the following symbols may be recorded on a line; in each instance, record all that apply. For example, a student may ask factual questions of both the instructor and of peers during a one-minute observation. Hence, both a T and a P would be recorded as described below.

X:	the behavior was observed
N	not appropriate or no opportunity, e.g., if the entire period consists of lecture, there may be no opportunity to observe whether students accurately execute lesson-related skills or activities.
T	represents teacher. For example, record a T if you observe that the student answers factual questions posed by the teacher (T) as opposed to those posed by a peer (P) or, perhaps, someone or something else such as a worksheet (X).
P	represents peer. For example, if you observe that a student asks higher order questions of a peer, enter a P.
+	indicates that the observed behavior was in a positive or correct direction (e.g., answered factual questions correctly).
-	indicates that the observed behavior was in a negative, inappropriate, or inaccurate direction (e.g., eye contact was observed but it was inappropriate such as with a peer while a teacher was giving instruction).

Shadowing Protocol: Behavioral Observation Recording Form

Behavioral Domain	Behavioral Indicators	Students					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Cognitive Knowledge/ Skills	Answers factual questions	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Asks factual questions	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Accurately executes lesson skill/activity						
Higher Order Thinking	Answers higher order questions	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Asks higher order questions	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Identifies problems (actual or potential)	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Spontaneously solves problems	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Evidence of skill or knowledge transfer (e.g., volunteers relevant information, makes new applications)	___	___	___	___	___	___
Communication	Eye contact	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Accurately follows instructions	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Speaks audibly	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Clearly expresses expectations	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Makes accurate inferences	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Uses sentence length that clarifies	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Gives clear instructions	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Listens intently (e.g., focuses on speaker, leans toward speaker)	___	___	___	___	___	___
Attitudes/ Affects	Volunteers	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Works independently	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Asks for help (+/-)	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Gives help	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Praises, supports/encourages others	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Shows care with task (e.g., handles materials carefully)	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Focuses on task	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Smiles	___	___	___	___	___	___
Socialization	Works cooperatively	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Participates/engages in lesson activity	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Is where he/she belongs (e.g., in seat during seatwork)	___	___	___	___	___	___
	Is nondisruptive	___	___	___	___	___	___
	(if disruptive, note behavior):	______________________					
	Shares with peers	___	___	___	___	___	___

Scoring the Observations

Instructions: Each student will have a percent score for each domain. Each domain score for each student is calculated as follows:

1. For student #1, domain #1 (Cognitive Knowledge/Skills), add the number of lines that contain X, T, P, and/or +. This total will become the numerator in calculating the student's percent score for domain #1.
2. Multiply the number of minutes (i.e., number of one-minute cycles) student #1 was observed by the number of behavioral indicators in the domain (e.g., domain #1 includes 3 indicators) and then subtract the number of total lines for student #1 in domain #1 that contain an N. The results will be the denominator in calculating the student's percent score for domain #1.
3. Divide the result of step #1 above by the result of step #2. The result of this calculation will be student #1's score (percent) for domain #1.
4. Repeat the above three steps for student #1, with regard to domains #2 (Higher Order Thinking), #3 (Communication), #4 (Attitudes/Affects), and #5 (Socialization).
5. Repeat steps #1-4 for each of the other students observed.

Scoring Grid:

		Students					
Domain		1	2	3	4	5	6
Cognitive Knowledge/ Skills	numerator:						
	denominator:						
	percent:						
Higher Order Thinking	numerator:						
	denominator:						
	percent:						
Communication	numerator:						
	denominator:						
	percent:						
Attitudes/ Affects	numerator:						
	denominator:						
	percent:						
Socialization	numerator:						
	denominator:						
	percent:						

MANUAL

Procedures for Using the Writing Analysis System (WAS) as a Tool in the Assessment of Student Outcomes

The following system is offered as a way to use samples of students' writing as tools for assessing a variety of outcomes such as self-esteem, cognitive skills, and higher order thinking. This system differs from other systems that (a) use writing samples to assess writing ability or (b) are based on pre-set, standardized writing assignments. Rather, this system attempts to (a) use writing to assess outcomes besides writing skills and (b) depend upon routine writing assignments that are a part of classroom or related instruction.

The writing analysis system (WAS) described below is a process based on procedures or methods other than traditional, standardized tests and it may be modified to meet a variety of assessment needs. The extent to which such modifications may be consistently or reliably applied by a number of different users warrants future study.

In using the WAS, it is important to recognize that while it is relatively comprehensive, it is not all inclusive. That is, there are possible indicators of the outcomes assessed by the WAS that have been excluded for various reasons. For example, the number of erasures in a piece of student writing may provide a negative indicator of self-confidence; however, it may alternatively indicate the positive development of self-regulation or editing skills. Hence, the WAS does not include ambiguous indicators such as the number of erasures. Applications of the WAS, however, may be modified to include such indicators when desirable and justifiable. For example, number of erasures might be included when the goal of a particular teacher for a particular student or group of students is to improve self-esteem through writing.

While the WAS differs from other assessment instruments and procedures in the ways described above, it is like other assessments in that it *samples* student performance; that is, it does not measure all aspects of every possible performance. For example, the items on standardized achievement tests represent samples of the knowledge and skills being assessed. Because assessment procedures and instruments necessarily provide a limited number and kinds of performance samples or indicators, it is vital that scores on individual items or subscales be interpreted in light of one another and in context.

Development of the WAS and Guidelines for Adapting It

The Writing Analysis System (WAS) was based on the need to evaluate an aspect of the Music Center of Los Angeles County, Education Division's (MCED's) Artists-in-Residence Program. The developmental procedures described below may also be used to adapt the WAS for applications in other situations. To illustrate, the steps leading to the development and experimental use of the WAS are listed below. They may be used as guidelines for future developmental activities.

1. The goals of the MCED's Artists-in-Residence Program were identified.

2. The overall goals of the Program were defined and categorized. This procedure was necessary because the Program had numerous subgoals or objectives which, appropriately, differed somewhat from classroom to classroom. The resulting, overall goal categories or domains were: cognitive knowledge and skills, communication, higher order thinking, affects and attitudes, socialization, and the development of school-artist partnerships.

3. The purpose of the WAS developmental activity was clarified. In this case (i.e., the MCED evaluation study), the purpose was to evaluate a particular program which was based on a specific set of program goals. While the WAS was developed for purposes of assessing a particular program, it may be modified and applied to individual students by considering the learning goals for those particular students. It may also be applied to groups or classes of students by modifying it in light of the learning goals for those groups of students.

4. The domains mentioned in step #2 above were evaluated to determine which of them might be appropriately assessed

using writing samples. The school-artist partnership domain, for example, was eliminated at this stage. Instead, questionnaires and observations were used to evaluate the partnership aspects of the program.

5. Lists of outcomes that might be associated with each of the domain was generated. For example, a surprise ending to a story might provide one indicator of creativity; the number of perspectives represented by a piece of writing might provide one indicator of socialization.

6. The lists were evaluated to determine which items in each goal category could be (a) considered, along with other items or other measures such as observations or interviews, as reasonable indicators of performance and (b) could be reliably measured.

7. Following this evaluation, items remaining on the lists were defined in terms of how they should be measured or "counted" when analyzing writing samples. These definitions are provided in a later section of this manual.

8. Reliability of the raters who would assess the writing samples used in the MCED evaluation study was established. Interrater reliability across the three raters ranged from 1.00 to .45 for individual items and from .94 to .62 for item clusters and domains. These reliability coefficients are

defensible, particularly if cluster and domain scores, rather than individual item scores, are used. In the future, the research team that conducted the MCED evaluation study plans to develop a technical manual for the WAS. A purpose of the technical manual will be to detail the procedures used in the reliability study, as well as other technical procedures, so that they may be replicated by those choosing to modify adapt the WAS.

9. A portfolio of writing samples was collected from students participating in an MCED Writing/Drama residency. The definitions provided below were used to analyze writing samples that were based on similar assignments and that were generated early and later in the residency.

Definitions and Procedures for Scoring

The information below is organized by domains. First, each domain is described. Then, the items making up each domain are defined in terms of how they are scored. In some cases, items are scored in pairs or clusters that provide more meaningful information than individual items. Also, when items cluster to describe a particular outcome or performance, cluster scores are more reliable than individual item scores. Similarly, domain scores are more reliable than item or cluster scores. A form for recording scores is included at the end of this manual.

Domain: Factual Knowledge/Skills

For purposes of the WAS, knowledge and skills were defined as being related to either the content of classroom instruction or to the content of the MCED residency. The underlying hypothesis is that arts education, both directly and indirectly, influences the acquisition of knowledge. Hence, factual knowledge/skills were defined as the extent to which writing samples provide evidence of skills and factual knowledge that were likely learned as a direct result of teacher or artist instruction or through reading or other educational media.

Item #1 (Factual Knowledge): Scoring

0=no directly stated or clearly implied facts
1=one such fact
2=two such facts
3=more than two such facts

Item #2 (Skills): Scoring

Assign one point for each of the following. If an item applies more than once (e.g., two places are described), assign one point only to the item.

___ Use of dialogue
___ Description of conflict (personal or interpersonal)
___ Description (not just name) of a character (actual, fictional, or fantasy). Description can be in terms of physical, personality, livelihood, etc.

___ Description (not just name) of a feeling or its manifestation (e.g., crying implies happiness or sadness). The feeling need not be named.

___ Description (not just name) of a place. The place need not be named.

___ Inclusion of sensations in one or more descriptions (e.g., how something tasted, smelled, felt, sounded).

Domain: Communication

The WAS considers both expressive and receptive aspects of communication as they may be indicated by students' writing. While the improvement of the mechanics of writing was not a goal of the MCED Program, it was an important incidental goal to the participating schools; hence, such mechanics are considered in the WAS as used in the MCED evaluation study.

Item #3 (Clarity): Scoring. Clarity is defined as the number of grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors. A single word may contain more than one error. For example, "Los angules" constitutes two errors because it is misspelled and should be capitalized. Two errors are also counted when there is no punctuation at the end of a sentence and no capitalization at the beginning of the next sentence. Stylistic errors, however, are not counted. For example, no errors are counted in the following run-on sentence because it contains no grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors: "Linda went to Los Angeles and went to the zoo and went to Disneyland and then went to the beach."

The score for this item is the total number of grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors divided by the total number of words in the writing sample.

Item #4 (Main Idea): Scoring. This item assesses the extent to which a main idea or theme is developed and is scored as follows.

0=no stated or clearly implied main idea or theme

1=A main idea or theme that is not elaborated with details or examples

2=A main idea or theme that is elaborated with one or more examples or details; some--but not all--of the details/examples may be irrelevant.

3=A main idea or theme that is elaborated with one or more examples or details; none of the details/examples may be irrelevant.

Item #5 (Components): Scoring. This item assesses the extent to which the writing sample presents a beginning (e.g., sets a context or describes a problem), middle (e.g., provides related details or examples), and end (e.g., a conclusion or closing; not necessarily a resolution). Item #5 is scored as follows.

0=No statement or clear implication of a Beginning (problem, context, or main idea), Middle (explanation, details, description, or examples), or End (conclusion or closing--not necessarily a resolution).

1=One of these: Beginning, Middle, End

2=Two of these: Beginning, Middle, End

3=Three of these: Beginning, Middle, End

Item #6 (Reception): Scoring. Reception refers to the extent to which the writing sample provides evidence that the writer clearly understood the assignment. The focus, in this domain (Communication) is on the students' understanding of the assignment rather than on skills taught throughout the residency which are evaluated in the Factual Knowledge/Skills domain.

In order to validly score this item, the rater must know the exact nature of the assignment and the context within which it was made. For example, in the case of the MCED evaluation study, an assignment was for students to write about when they felt "X,"--X being a "feeling" or emotion--without actually naming the feeling. In assigning scores, it was important for the researchers to understand that naming a feeling did not necessarily mean that a student did not understand the assignment as one or more feelings might be used to describe other feelings. Further, students were not restricted to describing only one feeling.

0=There is **nothing** about the writing sample to suggest that the student understood the assignment, i.e., there is **no** discernable relationship between the assignment and the sample.

1=The writing sample suggests that the student may have understood the assignment but probably did not.

2=The student probably understood the assignment but the rater has some doubt.

3=It is **obvious** that the student **clearly** understood the assignment. There is **no doubt** about the relationship between the assignment and the sample.

Domain: Higher Order Thinking

While many aspects of higher order thinking cannot be assessed using routine writing samples, writing samples may be used to obtain unobtrusive measures of convergent and divergent thinking which are important aspects of creative thinking, problem solving, and analytical thinking. Items in this domain assess the extent to which the writing sample provides indicators of convergent and divergent thinking which are related to creativity, problem solving, and analytical thinking.

Item #7 (Creative Twist): Scoring. Assign one point if the writing sample contains a surprise ending or creative twist that is relevant to the remaining content of the sample.

Item #8 (Problem Solving): Scoring. Assign one point for each of the following:

___ The student sets the stage by describing a problem or providing a context (e.g., by describing a situation).

___ The student states or clearly implies more than one actual or possible approach to the situation or more than one possible solution to the problem. If the rater is in doubt, no points are assigned. Also, the appropriateness of the approach or solution is **not** at issue, here.

___ The student states or clearly implies a reason or explanation for the outcome of his/her narrative (If in doubt, assign no points).

___ Assign an additional "bonus" point if the reason or explanation is logical or reasonable.

Domain: Self-Attitudes (Affects/Attitudes)

Some indicators of attitudes such as self-esteem and pride-in-work may show themselves in writing samples. Others, such as task engagement are better suited to other measures, e.g., observation. Items in this domain assess the extent to which the writing sample provides evidence of a positive self-attitude and pride-in-work (i.e., the assignment).

Item #9 (Tone): Scoring. Assign scores as follows.

1=student describes him/herself or his/her abilities or actions in a negative or pessimistic light. (Do not impose your own value system).

2=the student is not evident in the writing; hence, the extent to which he/she views self as capable, etc. cannot be determined.

3=the student/writer describes him/herself in a way that clearly implies he/she is capable, etc. in some regard.

Item #10 (Confidence): Scoring. The scoring presented below is based on the nature of the writing assignments used in the MCED evaluation study. It may be adapted to longer or different types of assignments.

1=The total number of words in the writing sample is 25 or less
2=26-50 words
3=51-75 words
4=76-100 words
5=More than 100 words

Item #11 (Pride-in-Work): Scoring. Assign scores as follows.

1=The appearance of the writing sample interferes with the reader's concentration on the message or content of the writing.
2=The appearance of the writing sample is not particularly neat, but it does not significantly interfere with the reader's ability to focus on the message or content of the writing.
3=By most standards (e.g., 95% of teachers, parents, etc.), the appearance of the writing sample would be judged as neat.

Domain: Socialization

Social development procedes along a continuum of self-centeredness to social awareness and appreciation. It includes such outcomes as awareness of other cultures and perspectives other than one's own and may show itself in behaviors such as sharing and cooperation. For purposes of the WAS, the assessment of socialization is necessarily restricted to "countables" that may be reasonably expected to appear in the kinds of writing assigned.

Item #12 (Social Awareness): Scoring. For reliability purposes, the WAS restricts its definition of social awareness to matters of race, religion, and ethnicity. For this item, assign one point if the writer names any race, religion, or ethnic origin. It may be the writer's own.

Item #13 (Cooperation): Scoring. Assign scores as follows.

1=The writer does not explicitly interact with others (the others need not be humans)

2=The writer interacts with others as a participant in an activity, but the activity is limited in its purposefulness to the participants (e.g., going to a movie with a friend when both of you have an implied, mutual purpose such as having fun).

3=The writer interacts, cooperates, collaborates, shares with others in a way that implies a sense of moral responsibility for the well-being of the group or humanity (e.g., working on a group project that will be graded, Christmas caroling at a rest home).

Item #14 (Perspective): Scoring. Assign scores as follows.

0=The writing sample describes or implies no viewpoints, including the writers

1=One viewpoint is described or implied; it may be the writer's

2=More than one viewpoint is described or implied; one of the viewpoint's may be the writer's

Cluster Scores

Cluster (Items 1 & 2): Factual Knowledge/Skills

Sum the points assigned to items #1 and #2 and divide the total by 9.

Cluster (Items 4 & 5): Focus

Add the scores assigned to items #4 and #5 and divide the total by 6.

Cluster (Items 7 & 8): Higher Order Skills

Add the points assigned to the items 7 and 8 and divide the total by 5.

Cluster (Items 9-11): Self-Attitudes (Affects & Attitudes)

Add the scores assigned to items 9, 10, and 11 and divide the total by 11.

Cluster (Items 12-14): Socialization

Add the points assigned to items 12, 13, and 14 and divide the total by 6.

Domain Scores

Factual Knowledge/Skills

This domain score is the same as the cluster score for items 1 and 2 as described above.

Communication

Add the scores for items 4, 5, and 6. Divide this total by 9. Then, add the quotient to the score for item 3.

Higher Order Thinking

This domain score is the same as the cluster score for items 7 and 8 as described above.

Self-Attitudes

This domain score is the same as the cluster score for items 9-11 as described above.

Socialization

This domain score is the same as the cluster score for items 12-14 as described above.

Teacher Log
1

TEACHER LOG: PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES

Instructions: In support of the Artists-in-Residence Program, the Music Center of Los Angeles is interested in promoting effective partnerships between teachers and artists. Please use the format below to list any of your activities, throughout the current residency, that may contribute to such partnerships. Your input will be used to help the Music Center better understand how the teacher-artist partnerships now work and how they might be changed in the future.

The activities you list below may be formal or informal. Sample activities may include some of the following: (a) ways in which you have followed-up on workshops or tied workshop concepts into classroom instruction--e.g., "I used the last workshop activity to provide examples of analogies in today's language arts lesson;" (b) informal discussions--e.g., "Two other participating teachers and I ate lunch with the artist and talked about how we might follow-up on today's workshop in our social studies unit on black history;" (c) formal meetings--e.g., "planning meeting for participating teachers and artists;" (d) individual exchanges with the artist--e.g., "asked the artist to integrate an upcoming workshop with a story being read in class;" etc.

If needed, attach additional sheets. Return completed forms at the final evaluation meeting. The completed forms will be treated confidentially and your anonymity will be protected. **THANK YOU.**

School: ____________________ Teacher: ____________________

Artist: ____________________ Grade: ____________________

Date (mo./day/yr.) Activity

1. __________ 1. ____

____

____

2. __________ 2. ____

____

____

3. __________ 3. ____

____

____

Date (mo./day/yr.) Activity

4. ________ 4. ________________________________

5. ________ 5. ________________________________

6. ________ 6. ________________________________

7. ________ 7. ________________________________

8. ________ 8. ________________________________

9. ________ 9. ________________________________

10. ________ 10. ________________________________

Comments:

ARTIST LOG: PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES

Instructions: In support of the Artists-in-Residence Program, the Music Center of Los Angeles is interested in promoting effective partnerships between artists and teachers. Please use the format below to list any of your activities, throughout the current residency at the school named below, that may contribute to such partnerships. Your input will be used to help the Music Center better understand how artist-teacher partnerships now work and how they might be changed in the future.

The activities you list below may be formal or informal. Sample activities may include some of the following: (a) ways in which you have used information provided by teachers as workshop tie-ins--e.g., "used a story being read in class as a vehicle for storytelling;" (b) informal exchanges with teachers--e.g., "ate lunch with two participating teachers and discussed how the current social studies unit on black history might build on workshop activities;" (c) formal meetings--e.g., "planning meeting for participating teachers and artists;" (d) offering ideas for connecting classroom curriculum with workshop activities--e.g., "provided a list of possible classroom activities for following-up on today's workshop;" etc.

If needed, attach additional sheets. Please return completed forms at the final evaluation meeting. They will be treated confidentially and your anonymity will be protected. **THANK YOU.**

School:________________________ Grade(s):________________________________

Artist:________________________ Teacher(s):______________________________

Date (mo./day/yr.) Activity

1. __________ 1. ____

____

____

2. __________ 2. ____

____

____

3. __________ 3. ____

____

____

Date (mo./day/yr.) Activity

4. ________ 4. ______________________________

____

____

5. ________ 5. ______________________________

____

____

6. ________ 6. ______________________________

____

____

7. ________ 7. ______________________________

____

____

8. ________ 8. ______________________________

____

____

9. ________ 9. ______________________________

____

____

10. ________ 10. ______________________________

____

____

Comments:

Observation Form: Planning Meetings

Protocol: Call contact person at school to introduce yourself by name and affiliation. Indicate that you'll be attending the meeting and confirm time, place, etc. Indicate that Melinda Williams of the Music Center knows that you plan to attend and that she or I (evaluation study project director) may be called if they have further questions.

Method: Take detailed notes. Be alert to who said/did what when. We will need to depend on these notes in addressing the items listed below as well as others that will surely arise.

Specific Items

- Date and location of meeting:
- Date of first workshop:
- Names and positions of those attending the meeting:
- Who "led" the meeting?
- For each person attending the meeting, describe the amount and kind of participation (e.g., Jan R., teacher, described her need to change the schedule; Buzz S., principal, offered to order supplies; John Y., artist, suggested goals for the residency and specific workshops for meeting each goal; etc.).
- What are the goals of this residency? (Be sure to get this information; if it is not self-evident, ask. Examples of pertinent questions include: "What do you hope that this residency accomplishes for yourselves, the school, and/or the students?" "What would you like the students to know or be able to do as a result of the residency?"
- What were the outcomes of this meeting?
- Attach your notes

Observation Form: Evaluation Meetings

Instructions: Use the form below to record your observations of the evaluation meeting associated with the end of a residency.

1. Date:

2. School:

3. Artist:

4. Actual length of the meeting, in minutes:

5. Of the following, mark (X) for those who attended the meeting:

_____ Music Center Representative

_____ Artist

_____ Principal

_____ School-Music Center Liaison (e.g., "Coordinator," "Contact Person")

_____ Teachers (Number attending/Number participating in residency): _____/_____

_____ Other:____

5. Who led the meeting?

6. Characterize the nature of the exchange among meeting participants by briefly describing the amount and kind of participation (e.g., The principal dominated the meeting and talked at length about the space and scheduling problems. All but one teacher were virtually silent; the vocal teacher . . ., etc.).

7. List the questions asked and the responses to them. Insofar as possible, indicate the source(s) of each response:

Question #1:

Response(s) #1:

Q2:

R2:

Q3:

R3:

Attach additional sheets as necessary.

Observation Form: Student Workshops (Phase I)

Protocol: Call contact person at school to introduce yourself and your affiliation (Music Center), your plans to observe the artist-in-residence, verify the schedule, address, etc. Offer Melinda William's and my name and phone number should they have further questions.

Method: Detailed notes of what happened, who said/did what when, etc. that will allow us to directly address the items below as well as others that will arise.

Specific Items

- Observer:

- Date, school, artist:

- Teacher:

- Class period and grade &/or subject area (e.g., 8:30-9:20, 9th gr. math class):

- Date of Planning Session:

- Given this class, what outcomes (knowledge, skills, behaviors, attitudes) seem particularly important to focus on?

- Given this particular class, what variables are important to take into account when selecting/interpreting outcomes (e.g., 20% speak no English; about 3/4 of the students have previous experience in the artists-in-residence program; the teacher seems skeptical about the program's potential benefits):

- Of the classes observed for this artist/teacher combination, which (e.g., students, teachers, focus) would be the best one(s) to follow, in-depth, throughout the course of the residency?

- Notes (attached):

Appendix B

Annotated Bibliography

Archer, B. (1980). The arts in education. In Arts in cultural diversity: A selection of papers presented at the 23rd world congress of the International Society for Education through Art in conjunction with the 7th biennial assembly of the Australian Society. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Type of Literature

Position paper addressing special population issues.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides a rationale for why art is important in understanding and preserving diverse cultural values and practices.

Summary

The author challenges the supposition that art is an organized body of knowledge. Rather, he states that art engages a distinct set of cognitive processes which are not only independent of verbal language and quantification, but represent a deeper structure. Art is representative of cultural practices and is therefore vital to the preservation and understanding of a culture.

Usefulness

Useful for establishing a broad, theoretical framework and for providing a rationale for the usefulness of the arts in education. The piece is, however, too theoretical to be useful to a school administrator who may be looking for concrete outcome measures of the effectiveness of arts education.

The Arts, Education, and Americans Panel (1977). _Coming to our senses: The significance of the arts for american education_. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Type of Literature

Book presenting theory-based positions.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides rationales for including art in school curricula.

Summary

This volume describes a number of ways in which arts education is beneficial to youngsters. The basic premise is that beyond being learned and enjoyed, the arts can be instrumental in teaching basic skills, and in furthering individual development.

Usefulness

The piece provides a number of theory-based reasons for including arts in the school curriculum. Gardner is a leading expert in the area of human intelligence.

Baltzer, S. (1988). A validation study of a measure of musical creativity. Journal of Research and Methodology in Education,. 36(4), 232-249.

Type of Literature

Data-based study.

Reason for Inclusion

Discusses a validation study of an assessment instrument entitled, "Measures of Creativity in Sound and Music (MCSM)."

Summary

The Measures of Creativity in Sound and Music (MCSM), an assessment instrument devised by Cecilia Wang, consists of four activities that provide scores of musical fluency and musical imagination. The validation evidence reported in this article was of moderate magnitude. Findings are at odds with those of Wang and Kageff (1986).

Usefulness

Provides a rationale for measuring creativity in the creator, rather than in the product, and reports on the validity of an instrument designed to do so.

Brant, R. (1987-88). On assessment in the arts: A conversation with Howard Gardner. Educational Leadership. 45(4), 30-34.

Type of Literature

Interview Summary.

Reason for Inclusion

To convey Gardner's views on assessment of learning in the arts. Gardner is a professor at Harvard and an internationally respected expert on human intelligence.

Summary

Through his work on art assessment with "Project Zero" at Harvard and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) which produces the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) as well as other assessments, Howard Gardner has developed what he feels to be a more meaningful type of art assessment. According to this methodology, three facets of art are assessed as the art is being produced: production, perception, and reflection.

Usefulness

Useful prototype for art assessment and/or art in the service of assessment.

Brunk, V.N. & Denton, J.J. (1983). Evaluation of a sociomusic curriculum for young learners. Texas Tech Journal of Education, 10(1), 43-47.

Type of Literature

Empirical study

Reason for Inclusion

Investigate the effects of integrating arts, social studies, and science on student achievement.

Summary

A four-group design which included one treatment group and three control groups was used with low SES, bilingual students in kindergarten, first-, and second-grades. The treatment was an integrated arts, social studies, and science curriculum. Results showed significant differences between the experimental and control groups in science, social studies and music achievement using achievement measures designed by one of the researchers. The authors concluded that an arts in education curriculum may have positive effects on learner achievement by promoting their cognitive processing of concepts.

Usefulness

Provides empirical support for an integrated curriculum that includes the arts.

Carey, R. (1985, April). A structure for the critique of student photographs. Paper presented At The Annual Meeting of the National Art Education Association, Dallas, TX.

Type of Literature

Professional paper presentation describing a non-traditional evaluation procedure..

Reason for Inclusion

Provides a technique for critiquing photography, a particular form of art.

Summary

This paper presents a technique for critiquing secondary and college level students' photography. According to Carey, students' photography assignments should include the following categories of information: (1) artist's intention; (2) subject; (3) technique; (4) composition; (5) miscellaneous considerations, such as mood and symbol; and (6) presentation--matting and framing craftsmanship. Students should be asked to consider plans and options in each category and to provide written narratives. The instrument used for the critiquing process is constructed as a Likert scale wherein students respond to statements about various photographs for each of four categories: intention, subject, technique, and composition. The instrument is especially effective with students taking photography on an elective basis and with those students who do not have extensive, prior experience in art or photography. The scale can be used by the teacher to critique student work, by the student for self-critique, or by a group of students to evaluate one another's work.

Usefulness

Provides an example of a non-traditional evaluation procedure.

Cohen, E.P., & Gainer, R.S.(1984). Art: Another language for learning, New York, NY: Schocken Books, 207-210.

Type of Literature

Summary of empirical findings.

Reason for Inclusion

To present an empirically supported rationale for teaching arts in elementary school. This work provides theoretical as well as data-based support for an arts program in effecting cognitive and affective growth.

Summary

This piece addresses the concerns of evaluating the effectiveness of an arts program in a school setting. Issues such as accountablity, methods of measurement, and various domains of growth are discussed. Substantiating data-based results are provided from several evaluative studies which illustrate the possible impacts arts education programs can have on student achievement and self-attitude.

Usefulness

This work may be useful to school administrators who are considering a school-based intervention program.

Coleman, D.R. (1983). Effects of the use of writing scale by gifted primary students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *27*, 114-121.

Type of Literature

Empirical study.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides a description of the effects of using a creative writing scale as an evaluative and instructional tool.

Summary

Two out of four middle-class schools consisting of gifted primary grade students were randomly selected to receive treatment and two were used for control purposes. Treatment consisted of the use of the Sager Writing Scale by students to evaluate their own narrative writing. The control group was, instead, asked to proofread their own writing. Following treatment, test results showed a significant difference between control and treatment group scores on the thematic maturity and style subtests of the Test of Written Language Vocabulary, on all four of the Sager subscales, and on a writing attitude survey. Results support that an evaluation instrument can provide students with a guide for writing and improve their writing significantly.

Usefulness

Useful for teachers, program administrators, and others who desire empirical support for implementation of a writing program based on students' self-evaluation of writing.

Cowie, H. (1983). An approach to the evaluation of children's writing. _Early Childhood Development and Care_, _12_, 319-331.

Type of Literature

Theory and research-based Position paper.

Reason for Inclusion

To provide information regarding developmental changes in children's writing.

Summary

This article discusses a research base which describes the kinds of developmental changes occurring in children's writing over time. Children's writing moves in an age-related sequence from the literal and factual to the metaphorical and affective. Furthermore,it reflects growth in the awareness of the psychological characteristics of the self and others.

Usefulness

Provides a theoretical frame for looking at changes in students' writing over time.

Demery, M. (1984). Self-esteem and elementary school art activities: An operational approach to acquiring and using self-esteem and art skills. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 156).

Type of Literature

Program description.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides a description of an elementary school art program and details the relationship of participation in this program and the enhancement of self-esteem.

Summary

In this paper, self-esteem is defined, and the characteristics of a child with high self-esteem are outlined. Conditions contributing to the development of high self-esteem include the following: environment, discipline and responsibility; encouragement; self-acceptance and heritage; teacher-student interaction; self-evaluation; self-respect; communication skills; and the ability to learn on one's own. Demry includes an instructor's guide that outlines seven activities which can renew and enhance the self-esteem of children through an emphasis on success, one-to-one and group interaction, basic art skills, multicultural awareness, and the uniqueness and worth of each individual. The seven activities involve the creation of a decoupage, marbleized painting, portraiture, blind contour drawing, mural painting, pinch pot sculpture, and advertisement. For each activity, a lesson plan lists concepts covered, self-esteem objectives, materials, procedure, references, and, where relevant, demonstration steps.

Usefulness

Provides a literature base regarding the relationship between arts education and self-esteem.

Eisner, E.(1979). Cross-cultural research in arts education: Problems, issues, and prospects. Art in Education, 21(1), 27-35.

Type of Literature

Position paper dealing with cross-cultural issues.

Reason for Inclusion

Addresses questions important to cross-cultural research in arts education.

Summary

Five topics are addressed with respect to the development of useful research in arts education: the state-of-the-art of arts education research, usefulness of arts education research, types of problems studied; problems in conceptualization, implementation and interpretation and future prospects of research in arts education. Issues such as the importance of arts education, scarcity of fiscal resources dedicated to cross-cultural research, lack of a systematic inquiry into arts education, and inherent difficulties in studying diverse cultures are highlighted. Recommendations are made for universal articulation among researchers by networking through research conferences and through the establishment of an international journal of art research.

Usefulness

Useful to researchers who are commited to meaningful arts education research that is sensitive to cross-cultural issues.

Eisner, E.W.(1972). Educating artistic vision. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Type of Literature

Summary of Eisner's ideas and work regarding arts education.

Reason for Inclusion

Eisner is a well-known expert in arts education. This book provides a theory-based rationale for teaching arts in school.

Summary

This book provides five justifications for teaching arts in the school: (1) One justification deals with the avocational interests that can provide a sense of satisfaction after work in school ceases. A second justification is therapeutic where art is used as a vehicle for self-expression and as contributing positively to mental health. A third justification argues that the development of creative thinking ought to be a primary goal of any good educational program. Art, it is claimed, has an especially important contribution to make to the development of creative thinking. A fourth justification argues that art activities develop students' understandings of the academic subjects , especially the social sciences. A fifth justification has a physiological base. For young children especially, art is said to develop the finer muscles and improve the child's coordination.

Usefulness

Provides a theory-based rationale for school-based arts instruction.

Eisner, E. (1980). The role of the arts in the invention of man. In *Arts in cultural diversity: A selection of papers presented at the 23rd world congress of the International Society for Education Through Art in conjunction with the 7th biennial assembly of the Australian Society*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Type of Literature

Position paper addressing cognitive development and cross-cultural issues.

Reason for Inclusion

To illustrate that man shapes art and that art shapes man as well.

Summary

Cognition is defined as encompassing all modalities through which the process of knowing one's environment occurs. Art enables this process through the use of sensory systems which lead to concept formation. Luria and Vygotsky, cognitive development theorists, are cited as providing support of the notion that the environment shapes intelligence, thus underscoring the importance of art as a means of interacting with the environment. Eisner states that in order for this active construction of learning through the arts to occur, quality programs must be established in school settings which translate from one culture to another and where the emphasis is on process rather than product evaluation.

Usefulness

Provides a theory-based rationale for the assessment of process over product.

Fitzgerald, J.& Teasley, A.B. (1986). Effects of instruction in narrative structure on children's writing. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 424-432.

Type of Literature

Empirical Study.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides evidence that direct instruction in components of a story can improve organization in story writing.

Summary

A two-group repeated measures design was used with fourth-graders. One group received instruction in knowledge of story structure; the other group received instruction in dictionary-word study. Results indicated a positive effect of instruction in story structure on organization and quality in story writing. This implies that, compared to instruction in writing mechanics, emphasizing the structure of writing improves writing quality.

Usefulness

Provides support for improving the quality of narrative writing through emphasis on writing structures rather than mechanics such as vocabulary development.

Ganz, A. (1984). Writers making meaning: How do young writers shape experience within the writing process? (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 971).

Type of Literature

Empirical study.

Reason for Inclusion

Describes a school writing program and a study designed to show the relationship between the development of student writing and the development of sociocentrism.

Summary

An examination of the journal writing of 14 second-grade students over the course of a school year reveals the evolution from egocentricity to sociocentrism. Throughout the year the students' drawings and writings reflected their learning about the world and their relationship to it. Early in the year the egocentric young writers touched on emotional, social, and cognitive areas of learning, often listing items which interested or confused them. Later, cause and effect entered into their writing as they formulated questions and concepts, tested hypotheses, and experimented with both language and thought in their creative writing.

Usefulness

Provides an example of how social growth and development may be taught via writing samples.

Garr, M (1988). How Writing, acting and monitoring create good advanced conversation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Chicago, IL.

Type of Literature

Research paper dealing with the arts and language minority issues.

Reason for Inclusion:

Describes an approach successfully used with language minority students.

Summary

Through the use of drama and videotape, non-native speakers of English (ESL students) were provided with opportunities to use language to deal with complicated social issues, monitor language usuage and become more sensitive to other cultures.

Usefulness

This paper is useful in highlighting the communcation problems that may occur in educating a culturally diverse student population.

Kindler, A.M. (1987). A review of rationales for integrated arts programs. The Journal of Issues and Research. 29(1), 52-59.

Type of Literature

Literature Review.

Reason for Inclusion

Reviews rationales for specific art programs that have been integrated into the general curriculum.

Summary

The fundamental assumptions of integrated and multi-arts programs can be summarized as follows: (a) there is a similarity across the arts; (b) incorporating the arts into other subject matter areas accelerates and facilitates the learning process; (c) the arts promote creativity; and (d) integrated arts programs are more economical than separate instruction in each area. This article discusses a number of integrated and multi-arts programs that have been introduced into elementary and secondary schools within the past ten years, and the rationales and/or assumptions on which they are based. Kindler concludes that educators and others concerned with integrated and unified arts curriculum planning should not be satisfied with intuition-based evaluation of their programs. Instead, they should direct their efforts toward the implementation of more scientific methods for evaluation and further development of integrated and multi-arts curricula.

Usefulness

Provides a rationale for the need for structured evaluation in arts education.

Merrion, M. & Larsen, C. How do you evaluate a music teacher? *Principal*, *66*(1), 30-32.

Type of Literature

Position piece.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides a rationale for music education.

Summary

This article details eight reasons for the inclusion of music education in the schools: (1) An important purpose of the schools is to transmit cultural heritage, and music is one manifestation of that heritage. (2) The schools have an obligation to help each student to develop his or her musical potential, a basic ability that exists in every individual. (3) Music provides an outlet for creativity and for self-expression. (4) Music in the school provides an opportunity for success for some students who have difficulty with other aspects of curriculum. (5) Formal study of music can sharpen one's sensitivity, raise one's level of appreciation, and expand one's musical horizons. (6) Music is one of the most powerful and profound symbol mediums that exists. Just as everyone must learn our verbal and mathematical symbol systems, so too should everyone learn the symbol system represented by music. (7) It is important for the student to realize that in life not every question has a single right answer. Music teaches this well. (8) Music exalts the human spirit and enhances the quality of life

Usefulness

This article provides hypotheses regarding the value of music (arts) education.

Moore, M.T. (1985). The Relationship between the originality of essays and variables in the problem-discovery process: A study of creative and noncreative middle school students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Virginia Beach, VA.

Type of Literature

Empirical Study.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides empirical support for the relationship between problem solving abilities and creative production.

Summary

Eight students identified as creative were matched with low creative students using sex, grade, and IQ. Each student wrote one composition in a lab situation. The task was to produce a piece of writing incorporating any or all of 15 displayed objects. The results from three process measures at the problem-solution stage and two panels of five judges rating the written products indicate that individuals who had the most original products were consistently higher on the process variables at both the problem-formulation and problem-solution stages. Two conclusions from the data are suggested: (1) writers and artists who exhibit a concern for problem-discovery at the problem-formulation stage will have the most originally rated products; and (2) during composing, writing or drawing, writers and artists share similarities in problem-discovery cognitive strategies even though the medium differs.

Usefulness

Based on eight, carefully matched pairs of creative versus less creative students, the study provides empirical support for the importance of problem-solving processes to creative production.

Ortony, A., et al (1985). Cultural and instructional influences on figurative language comprehension by inner city children. Technical report No. 335, Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, MA.

Type of Literature

Empirical study.

Reason for Inclusion

Examines cultural and instructional influences on; language comprehension is an artists-in-Residence program.

Summary

Through a residency for visiting artists program, Black writers were used as part of an intervention treatment. Each were assigned to a school in Harlem, New York. The writers worked with a total of thirteen classes which met once a week with children in grades 4-6. A total of 319 children participated. Five other classes not participating in the program were chosen as a control. The primary aim of each instructor was to develop in the children a knowledge of figurative language by exposure to a street game called "sounding". Results show that children who received creative writing instruction which emphasized the use of figurative language improved slightly in comprehension of such language. Those who engaged more frequently in "sounding" understood figurative language better than those who engaged in it less often.

Usefulness

The study provides empirical support for Writers-in-Residence in the development of figurative language among inner city, minority students.

Parke, B.N. & Byrnes, P. (1984). Toward objectifying the measurement of creativity. Roeper Review, 6 (4), 216-218.

Type of Literature

Position piece.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides guidelines for assessing creativity in the schools.

Summary

This article provides six guidelines for designing an instrument to measure creativity. These include: (1) Determine the factors associated with creativity that you wish to address. (2) Employ multiple measures to assess the creativity factors chosen. (3) Include performance measures in the assessment package. (4) Provide opportunity for students to display potential as well as performance. (5) Consider assessment schema to determine the types of creative talent it will identify and that which it will not identify. (6) Remember that assessment must be ongoing. The article also details the Detroit Public Schools Creative Product Scales as an example of a viable approach for measuring creativity.

Usefulness

Provides reasonable guidelines for developing evaluation methodology for assessing creativity and provides an example of the approach used in a large, urban school district (Detroit).

Schack, G. (1986). Self-efficacy for creative productivity. Paper Presentation, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Type of Literature

Data-based study.

Reason for Inclusion

Describes a procedure for assessing self-efficacy.

Summary

The Efficacy Scale for Creative Productivity (ESCreP) was developed to measure students' convictions that they could be creative producers. Three types of activities designed to provide enrichment for gifted students are related to efficacy: (1) exploration of topics; (2) training in processes necessary to carry out investigations; and (3)student-initiated investigations of problems. The 40-item ESreP was pilot tested with 369 gifted students in grades 4 to 12. Test reliability ranged from .71 to .94. Completion of type 3 activities was the best predictor of creative productivity efficacy scores. Years of participation in the gifted program was also a significant factor, but grade level and sex were not. The six-item Efficacy Scale for Overall Creative Productivity (ESOreP) administered to 294 gifted students in grades 4 to 8, measured efficacy at completing a type 3 project, rather than performing the parts of one. Internal consistency was .78 and test-retest reliability was .56. The relationship between the parts versus the whole issue was ambiguous.

Usefulness

Since self-efficacy is a goal of some art education programs appropriate measures are desirable. This article reports the development and testing of a procedure potentially relevant to circumstances similar to those described by Schack's study.

Stein, S. (1988). Explorations in making meaning: A case study. Insights into Open Education, 20, 2-15.

Type of Literature

Empirical Study.

Reason for Inclusion

Uses a case study approach to document the emergence of expressive writing ability.

Summary

Stein followed the writing progress of a student by collecting writing samples. She concluded that when conditions are provided which allow children to use their knowledge to express themselves, good writing emerges.

Usefulness

Provides longitudinal, data-based testimony in support of the effectiveness of a writing instruction. Including more than one case would have contributed to the Validity of Stein's conclusions.

Steveni, M. (1968). Art and education. New York, NY: Atherton Press.

Category

Theory and research-based discussion of creativity and the schools.

Purpose:

To provide a discussion of creativety in the classroom.

Summary:

This book discusses creativity in the school setting. It includes a brief outline of creativity research, highlighting the work of McPherson and Guilford. The article also details aids to creativity, including thirteen factors, espoused by Torrance to enhance creativity in the classroom as well as factors found to inhibit individual and group creativity. Guilford and Torrance are scholarly pioneers in the gifted education arena.

Usefulness

Provides a theory and research base for factors influencing the relationship between schooling and students' development of creativity.

Stiggins, R.J. (1987). Measuring thinking skills through classroom assessment (Report No. 143). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Type of Literature

Data-based study.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides a summary of procedures used by teachers to assess outcomes such as higher order thinking.

Summary

Classroom assessment procedures of 36 teachers in grades 2 to 12 from the same suburban school district in the Pacific Northwest were studied to determine the extent to which they measure higher order thinking skills of students in mathematics, science, social studies and language arts. Gathering information from teachers involved four steps: (1) The teachers were interviewed about their plans for an instructional day; (2) The teachers were observed by a trained observer for all class periods of the day; (3) Teachers provided observers with four to six samples of paper and pencil assessment instruments recently used; and (4) Each teacher was interviewed indepth after the day of observation. In both written and oral assessments, teachers focused nearly half of their assessments on the simple recall of facts and information. Inference and analysis received less attention, and comparison and evaluation were almost ignored. Teachers at various grade levels were surprisingly similiar in their assessment patterns.

Usefulness

Empirically illustrates the need for strategies designed to assess higher order skills.

Wakefield, F. (1987). The outlook for creativity tests. Paper Presented at the Council for Exceptional Children's Topical Conference on the future of Special Education, Orlando, FL.

Type of Literature

Theory-based position paper.

Reason for Inclusion

Provides a theory base for creativity assessment.

Summary

In general, this paper promotes the idea that new approaches to creativity testing are needed. Research has focused on the relationships between creativity and insight, divergent problem solving, problem finding, and intelligence. Wakefield proposes situational model of creativity which defines creativity as a meaningful response to open-problem, open-solution situations. The model explains relationships between the different types of thinking skills and explains why creativity and intelligence are not highly correlated. Based on this model, a new test of creativity is being developed. At present, no one measure of creativity is adequate, but combinations of intelligence tests, problem-solving tests, personality tests, and occupational interest inventories can be used to provide a clearer assessment of creativity.

Usefulness

Provides a rationale for new, non-traditional forms of creative testing and emphasizes the importance of using more than one data source to assess aspects of creativity.

Warnick, E.M. (1985). Overcoming measurement and evaluation phobia. Music Educators Journal 71(8)33-40.

Type of Literature

Position piece.

Reason for Inclusion

Illustrates the relevance of evaluation in music (arts) instruction.

Summary

This article emphasizes the importance of evaluation in music education, as well as the importance of developing appropriate evaluation methodology. Validity, reliability, correlation coefficients, and the difference between aptitude and achievement tests are discussed.

Usefulness

Useful as a guide to basic measurement and evaluation concepts for those interested or involved in arts education and assessment.

Appendix C

Schedule of Residencies

MCED Residency Schedule 1989-90

Dates	School Site	Years in Program	Artist	Discipline	School Ethnicity	Grade Level(s)	Avg. # Students/ class	# of Classes
9/14-3/6/90	01	2	A	Visual Arts	65% Cauc, 20% Hisp, 11% Black, 4% Asian	6 - 8	34	4
9/15-4/17/90	02	4	B	Drama	38% Hisp, 30% Cauc, 17% Asian, 7% Port, 7%Black, 1% Other	7 - 9	15	Pull Out
9/20-2/23/90	03	2	C	Drama	71% Hisp, 13% Asian, 11% Cauc, 5% Other	6	28	3
9/20-12/20	04	4	D	Drama	80% Hisp, 15% Cauc, 5% Asian	7, 8	35	4
9/20-2/14/90	05	2	E	Visual Arts	71% Hisp, 23% Cauc, 3% Black, 3% Other	4, 5	25	5
9/21-12/14	06 and 07	2	F	Drama	61 % Hisp, 35% Cauc, 4% Other	2, 5	25-32	4
9/28-12/29	08	6	G	Drama	64% Cauc, 21% Hisp, 8% Black, 5% Asian, 2% Other	K - 5	28	4
9/29-1/31/90	09	1	E	Visual Arts	70% Black, 30% Hisp	1, 2, 3	20-27	4
9/29-1/31/90	09	1	E	Visual Arts	70% Black, 30% Hisp	1 - 3	28	4
10/3-3/27/90	10	2	F	Music Theatre	58% Cauc, 25% Hisp, 10% Black, 7% Asian	7, 8	90 total	N/A
10/4-12/14	11	2	G	Dance	96% Hisp, 3% Cauc, 1% Black	2 - 6	27	4

Dates	School Site	Years in Program	Artist	Discipline	School Ethnicity	Grade Level (s)	Avg. # Students/ Class	# of Classes
10/5-2/08/90	03	2	H	Dance	71% Hisp, 13% Asian, 11% Cauc, 5% Other	2	28	4
10/5-1/26/90	12	1	B	Drama	63% Black, 36% Hisp, 1% Other	1, 2	25	4
10/5-1/30/90	13	2	I	Visual Arts	80% Hisp, 12% Cauc, 6% Black, 2% Other	1-5	28	5
10/10-1/29/90	14	2	J	Dance	98% Cauc, 2% Other	4-6	22	5
10/10-12/19	15 and 16	2	K	Dance	62% Hisp, 28% Cauc, 5% Black, 4% Asian, 1% Other	2-5	29	4
10/11-12/14	17	2	L	Dance	75% Black, 25% Hisp	5	27	5
10/16-5/3/90	18	6	G	Writing/ Video	84% Black, 7% Cauc, 6% Hisp, 3% Other	5, 6	21-26	4
10/17-12/4/89	09	1	M	Drama	70% Black, 30% Hisp	K	28	5
10/19-3/8/90	03	2	N	Drama	71% Hisp, 13% Asian, 11% Cauc, 5% Other	5	28	3
10/20-1/24/90	12	1	L	Dance	63% Black, 36% Hisp, 1% Other	3, 4	28	4
10/23-3/16/90	19	1	O	Drama	90% Black, 10% Hisp	3	29-30	4

Dates	School Site	Years in Program	Artist	Discipline	School Ethnicity	Grade Level (s)	Avg. # Students/ Class	# of Classes
10/30-3/13/90	05	2	P	Music Theatre	71% Hisp, 23% Cauc, 3% Black, 3% Other	1-5	28-33	3
11/15-5/10/90	20	2	A	Visual Arts	59% Cauc, 30% Hisp, 5% Asian, 4% Black, 2% Other	3,4	32	4
11/16-5/2/90	18	6	I	Visual Arts	84% Black, 7% Cauc, 6% Hisp, 3% Other	4, 5	22-31	4
12/5-5/29/90	12	1	F	Music Theatre	63% Black, 36% Hisp, 1% Other	5, 6	30	4
12/12-5/21/90	21	2	J	Dance	67% Hisp, 21% Cauc, 8% Black, 4% Other	4-6	27-28	5
12/12-3/21/90	17	2	Q	Dance	75% Black, 25% Hisp	3	27	4
1/3-4/25/90	03	2	R	Writing/ Drama	71% Hisp, 13% Asian, 11% Cauc, 5% Other	4	27-28	4
1/4-4/4/90	09	1	S	Drama/ Shakespear	70% Black, 30% Hisp	4	22-23	5
1/4-3/29/90	22	5	T	Dance	88% Cauc, 9% Hisp, 3% Asian	1-5	28-32	5
1/8-3/28/90	23	6	K	Dance	38% Asian, 32% Hisp, 20% Cauc, 6% Black, 4% Other	4	27-28	5

Dates	School Site	Years in Program	Artist	Discipline	School Ehnicity	Grade Level (s)	Avg. # Students/ Class	# of Classes
1/9-6/20/90	24	1	M	Drama	47% Cauc, 19% Asian, 16% Black, 16% Hisp, 2% Other	4, 5	28	5
1/9-5/22/90	25	1	I	Visual Arts	Special Education Class	13-16 Year-Olds	12	1
1/10-4/5/90	09	1	U	Music	70% Black, 30% Hisp	2	21-23	5
1/17-3/23/90	26	2	B	Drama	59% Hisp, 18% Black, 16% Cauc, 6% Asian, 1% Other	3, 5	31	4
1/30-4/4/90	27	6	G	Drama	64% Cauc, 21% Hisp, 8% Black, 5% Asian, 2% Other	K-5	28	4
2/1-4/19/90	17	2	V	Drama	75% Black, 25% Hisp	2	27	4
2/14-4/16/90	28	1	M	Drama	48% Black, 43% Hisp, 8% Cauc, 1% Asian	2, 4, 5	24-30	4
2/28-6/13/90	09	1	E	Visual Arts	70% Black, 30% Hisp	1	27	4
3/1-5/3/90	03	2	L	Dance	71% Hisp, 13% Asian, 11% Cauc, 5% Other	3	26	4
3/6-6/21/90	09	1	L	Dance	70% Black, 30% Hisp	3,	24-26	5
3/9-6/19/90	29	1	W	Visual Arts	40% Black, 28% Cauc, 17% Hisp, 11% Asian, 1% Other	4, 5, 6	90 total	N/A

Dates	School Site	Years in Program	Artist	Discipline	School Ethnicity	Grade Level(s)	Avg. # Students/ Class	# of Classes
3/27-6/26/90	30	1	E	Visual Arts	95% Hisp, 4% Cauc	5	34	4
3/27-6/20/90	12	1	B	Drama	63% Black, 36% Cauc, 1% Other	1, 2, 3	29	5
4/3-5/30/90	31	1	B	Drama	80% Hisp, 10% Cauc, 5% Black, 5% Asians	2-5	31	4
4/11-6/15/90	24	1	M	Drama	47% Cauc, 18% Asian, 15% Black, 15% Hisp, 5% Other	K, 2, 3, 4	28-32	8
5/23-6/19/90	12	1	L	Dance	63% Black, 36% Cauc, 1% Other	3, 4	28	4

Appendix D

Transcripts of Responses to Open-Ended Questionnaire Items ("Commments")

Comments: Student Survey

I learned a lot, but he was really strict.

I enjoyed the artist coming to my school. I enjoyed acting many things out. I enjoy learning about poetry. I think the classes should be twice a week.

I really liked the puzzels that we did in the workshops. I didn't like when we sat down the whole time.

I liked everything.

My favorite thing is what sport am I watching. Peter shouldn't stop doing anything. I really had fun with Peter. He should come back next year.

My favorite thing was the puzzles that we did. I liked everything.

What store am I in? What sport am I watching?

I wish Peter would come. And I like acting out things or doing small plays.

The phone was fun. The store was fun too. I didn't like the stories. I didn't get to participate in any of them. Only sun and wind.

I thought it was fun on the last play. I learned that arts just aren't pictures and paintings. I think that Peter should use the teachers in the same things.

I liked the games we played with the artist. Mostly the guessing games. I learned I can act if I put my mind to it. When I had to be the one acting I felt nervous. When I wasn't acting I felt great.

I learned it's a hard job becoming an artist, especially when you have to act infront of a live audience. Yes, the activities were very fun. I felt good about going to artist and residents. You should have this event every single year to all grades. (ten years in a row. Suggestion)

I really didn't like it, but it was fun. I like playing the games with the artist. It was fun but I wouldn't want to do it again!

I like Peter because he was funny and had good ideas about the plays we did. I think he was great when we played the telephone game and what store are you in, and how you told us stories.

I liked the telephone. I learned that story telling is fun, and neat. I think that they should make longer times.

I learned that I can do anything if I try. I liked most acting in silence. The stories were kind of interesting. I liked most of the things that we did.

I liked acting. I felt good and I think you should get a class for the whole year.

I didn't really like working with the artist we had. I thought the activities we did were boring. Some of them were okay though. I didn't feel like I learned anything. I don't think people should be forced to do what they don't want to do, like going up in front of everybody and doing something that I didn't really like. I also think you should have a choice whether or not to go to the lessons.

At first I really didn't like it but then I thought it was okay.

I like it when we do the play for all the people in school. I liked all the things that we did. I wish I could be in the artist again. I learned that we could think in our mind. And picture in our mind. When my friend tell me stories I think in my mind. And the picture. I learn a lot about what we did with the Artist. So I think we should do it again. It was fun.

I like the way he acted things out. It takes time to be a good artist, I am glad we got Peter.

I think working in Artist-in-Residence was very helpful to me and fun. The reason why is because I learned that if I worked hard and can do what I want to do, and also that I shouldn't be nervous when I'm on stage by myself. A way I think you can improve Artists-in-Residence is that we can spend much more time working. Glad I had Artist in Residence. I loved it. I know that you will have much success with the kids in Artists-in-Residence in the future!

I liked the games the best. I disliked the poems the most. I think there should be more games and stories.

I think it was not fun because he treated us like babies. I learned that you can think better.

I liked how we acted out the plays and figured out some story problems. I didn't like how his attitude was when some people acted wrong.

I like it when he tells stories.

I liked the homework machine. I liked the stories a lot.

What I liked about the artist was the stories he told us and the nice fun games. Also the plays we did with him.

I thought it sucked.

The acting.

I like when he tells a story.

Act

I enjoyed the stories and the play we did. I hope we have artist-in-residence next year.

I liked when we did the What Story Am I Watching. He was very fun.

Doing the activities and listening to the story.

I like when he tells stories. And I like the homework machinets.

Well, I like it when we act out parts. It made me feel very proud of myself. I also like when he tells us all the stories. It also made my teacher proud of me too. I am proud of what I'm doing right now!

I like the machines. That's all folks!

Soty and machinets.

I liked all the plays we did!

I liked when he told all those outstanding marvellous stories.

Games, poems, puzzles, solving problems.

What I like best about this is how he lets us get up on stage and try to do our best. I think that that would be the most fun.

I like the Ribber and lone one.

More human machines- less stories.

How he mused and also how he told stories.

I liked the best part, when we did the machine, and I really liked the artists stories.

I liked the stories. When you acted out what stories you were in.

I learned how to act better. I liked when we did the play. I felt better than I ever did. Some improving ideas are the classes should be longer and more games to play in front of the classs. I wish I can go back to the workshop.

I learned a lot as the artist worked with our class. I learned about using my imagination, doing the things I'm capable to do, and more. I hope the artist still works.

I really liked the end of the session presentation. I liked it probably because I had a big part in it. I liked how Peter called up volunteers. He gave everybody a fair chance. He encouraged us to do our best.

I enjoyed doing the fun activities like store telephone, and I also liked listening to the poems he read to us. I think that my class and myself learned something from him (my acting teacher).

Well I liked the big play. And I think you should use more props. It makes the actors feel like they are real actors.

I liked the stories. He said they were fun.

The thing I enjoyed the most was when we did the funny program. It was very exciting. I think having more stories and more vivid stories is something I would like more of if I did the workshop again.

I liked being in the play, being home alone.

I liked the games we played wirh Peter. I learned that I could do anything I wanted to do if I tried. I felt good whenever we had acting lessons. I do not have any ideas to help next years workshop.

I like most when we do the wind and the sun. It was the best thing I did. I would like to work more with the artist.

I enjoyed working with Peter because we act it out of school to people to see what we learned from Peter. He's a nice person of other study. I hope one day he comes back to teach us to act it out again.

I would like to work more with Peter and with other artists because Peter expresses himself and is very funny. I enjoyed the games we played and acting out things with Peter too.

I didn't like the artist because he got me into trouble and I didn't do anything. He's too into getting people into trouble.

He was cool. I liked acting out the stories he told. I felt like totally stoked. I think that you don't need to improve the workshops.

Peter, I enjoyed what you did for me. It was fun. I wish you could work more with me. The activity I enjoyed the most was the presentation. You taught me and the class very, very much.

I really enjoyed working with the artist because he's fair, and he tells neat stories, and also he never leaves you behind.

I enjoyed doing pantamiming like "What store am I in?" It was fun during the play. I got to be a wave with some other friends and I got to have a funny part. Peter was great. I enjoyed the time we had and wish we could do it next year. I have no improvements.

I like doing the activities. My favorite one is the phone. I would like to spend more time with him. I like being fun and silly and I really enjoyed working with him.

I like the phone game that he did. I like the store game that he did. I like the presentation that he helped us do. I like the stories he did for me. I like the jokes he did for me. I hope the best for you.

When we played games with him it was fun. And performances...

I like working with the artist. You let the artist teach us more longer.

He is a good artist.

It was totally cool.

I like it when he expressed feeling of the character in the stories. I like his sound effects.

You were really good Peter Kors.

It is ok and: would like to go back.

He was nice! And funny.

I liked the best when Peter asked the question after the finish.

No comment.

It was nice! But my legs fell asleep, and he called on the same people all the time.

It was nice.

Peter was a helpful person. He made us believe in ourselves that we could do things if we really try.

It was a fun experience for me and my peers. The other kids should have the same experience.

I liked his emotions in the exciting part of his story. I learned a lot from Peter. I liked working with him.

I learned that you could be a great person if you want to be a great person. And I thank him for that. Very, very, very, very, very, very, very, very much!

I liked doing the telephone and I learned how to tell stories. I felt happy when we had artist-in-Residence. I think we could improve on the participating and listening and Peter not telling people to shut up. Man I'll boss him up by golly if I see him again.

I liked working with Peter because he was a lot of fun. I learned how to act, pretend, and imagine many different wonderful things. They do a very good job.

I enjoy working with Peter because he has a lot of fun activities for us that goes to artist and residence. Peter tought me how to tell stories etc.

I liked the activities we did. I learned pretty much everything he wanted us to learn. He was a pretty good teacher. He was also weird in a good sort of way.

I liked when he told stories and fables. Also the games he played with us. And last but not least I liked it when we did skits about what we were afraid of.

I liked the games mostly. Because I am a person who likes drama and fun games. I learned that if you try your best you will always get whatever you want to do. I felt great going up and doing plays.

I liked when the artist told stories and did activities. I felt good when the artist called on me to answer questions.

I like about him when he ask me to go up and perform and I like a lot. He was good to me. And I want him to come back.

I like the whole thing because it helps us learn and we can get up and just so the thing that you want us to do and I think it's good for us.

I liked the stories that you told us. And I also think it was fun with you Peter and I think you should do the same thing next year.

I like when you tell us the rabbit shot the sun. That was a good one. And the rabbit and the long one. It was funny.

I like when he tried to let us figure out what the puzzle was but I only like it a little bit when we did the clock. But I liked everything else.

I liked when we got to act out the clock.

I like the game we played which was what store am I in and what sport am I watching. I like the story that Peter told us a lot.

I thought the whole thing was great.

I think that Peter Kors was fun. Iiked the best was his stories. I thought it was a great class. I liked acting out stories and poems and what story am I in.

I really liked when we acted out the sports and shops or stores. I really hated when Peter said we couldn't lay down. We always sat down. And we were tired. I really hated that. And I hated when he screamed at us.

I really liked doing what story am I in. I think Peter did a good job. But I think everyone needed to go up to act something out more. And they need to get more time.

I hated him always saying shut up.

I liked working with Peter because of his creativeness. He taught me just to care about what I thought no one else. He was fun, most of the time! Sometimes he was really boring.

What I learned in the Artist-in-Residence: I learned how to tell stories using your own imagination. I hope I get it again.

I like the last class with Peter the most. I have learned that we could do something we really wanted to do if we tried. I only have one suggestion on improvement. Sound more excited!

I wish that we can have other artists at the school. I feel that all schools should have an artist.

I liked that he gave us a chance to play the games that we played. He was a great speaker, artist and actor. I really enjoyed working with Peter.

I liked his stories.

I like how he dress up. I enjoy working with Peter. He acts great. I like how he acts out the poems or stories. I enjoyed artist.

I liked him. He was funny. I didn't know him that much but the time I was I enjoyed it.

I didn't really like it when he made everyone participate in everything we did because I didn't have an idea, so I thought up something stupid and made a fool of myself. But I enjoyed having this, it was fun and exciting. Peter was a great teacher!

I like to play the stories and the phone calls. I felt happy when we work and do our play. I learned a lot of things from Peter but I forgot the names.

I like when Peter did the little plays and when He told a story. He would sort of change his voice. I learned new stories and with the stories he tells me I tell my sisters them and they enjoy them.

I learned things about poems and how to express things by not talking. I liked the phone game and "what store am I in game" the most. You could improve by making it longer and having more activities insteas of the same thing every day.

I think I liked the last one the best because I like to do stuff in front of people. What I liked best when working with the artist is he was nice. You never got left out and every one got a turn doing something and you got to tell your own story after she or he got through with the real story.

I learn to act and I learn a lot of stuff. And I like to pretend to be in a shop.

What I like about it is when he put in felling and he let put our own opinion and I felt good about myself because at first I was kind of shy and embarrassed but now I'm not. What I most like about working with him was he understood all of us.

The best thing I liked was acting out stories. Our artist was very nice and was a good story teller and expressed his feelings.

I enjoyed pretending to be called someone and would like other classes to experience Artist-in-Residence.

School: 112th Street
Artist: Mr. McCall
Grade: 5

I think I learned how to sing and dance more. I think that I felt pretty good about this thing. I think that all the fifth grade classes as a group couls stand on the stage and each one tell us a little about themselves and tell us what they really liked about the school.

I love working with the artist because we can do dance. I learned a lot of dance but I can't know them because I can't.

The artist was fun to work with. I like the dance the artist taught us. I felt like screaming.

What I like most about Mr. McCall is he is a nice person to krpw and he let us try his activities, and the class that does the dance the best gets the dance and we try the next dance and if you don't get that dance you get the next one.

What I like about Mr. McCall is that when we do something bad he doesn't scream at us. He just lets us do it over where we made the mistake.

I learned that when you dance you have to have rhythm. I like the artist very much. I like the wa-wa dance.

I like working with the artist and doing dances with the artist. I like the dances we're going to do for the comatation. I like the things we do with the artist. I have lots of fun with the artist.

I learn different things in dance class. I get along with other people, and I have a good attitude in class with my teacher Mr. Keller.

Mr. McCall, you showed me a lot about dance that I didn't know. Thank you for teaching me that there are slow dances as well as fast.

The thing that I learned with Mr. McCall were the dances and all the excercises. I felt good doing things with Mr. McCall because I really enjoyed him because he was always fun. I always felt good with him because he was really enjoyable.

I like the way the artist tought us how to do the new dance. He made me feel proud of myself and he helped me with my attitude.

I love to work with Mr. McCall again. The thing I like about the artist is that he teaches us like we were the way we worked with him. I learned that you had to learn in class every time the teacher taught.

I like the artist because he taught us a very nice dance. I learned a good dance and it was a very good one. It felt very good because we were learning about different steps in the dances.

What I liked to do with the artist is when we do the exercizes I learned how to do different dances. I feel that the artist wants us to try our best. I like working with him.

I liked most about working with the artist because he is a good artist to work with. And is fun working with the artist. And I wish I could work at the other school I am going to.

I think the artist is a great guy, great dancer, and a good instructor.

School: Keppel
Artist: Ruben Garfias
Grade: 4

I'd like doing this with the artist. It was fun because I'd like to be an artist. When I grow up it is going to be fun being an artist.

He showed me how to think for myself.

I felt happy because we did a lot of things together and I learned to be nice to other people and listen to the teacher.

Thank you for showing me to be a good student. I like working with you a lot.

I loved to go with Ruben because he showed us a lot of things that we didn't know. When I try to act at something, I remember what we did with Ruben. THANKS Ruben.

I want to be an artist.

I liked when the dog yelled and the baby played follow the dog. And I like it when they play and kiss.

I like when Jesse grab me on my leg and thank Ruben for doing hard to do better.

Thank you for teaching me to be an actor like you Ruben. Thank you.

I like it when we were all playing the play.

Thung the sing noles.

I like a lot working with Ruben.

Thank you great actor

I learned to do some things I never have seen. I liked to go with Ruben because he showed us a lot of things that we now have to do.

Thank you because you showed me how to be an actor.

School: Community School
Artist: Glenna Avila
Grade: 5

I had a lot of fun. I learned how to paint without getting dirty. What I like most about Glenna was that she was very nice and helpful.

I like having Glenna because she was real nice and she helped us out a lot.

I am proud of myself because of the great job everyone did on the project on the wall.

She was a good artist because she was real nice.

I had a fun time painting on the mural because I like to paint but I don't want to be an artist. I learned not that much but painting with other people makes it more fun. I liked painting with the artist because she was nice.

I liked coloring the fish with colors. I learned that you have to concentrate to get your work completed correctly.

I have become very attached to Glenna Alvia. Glenna was like a mother, father, or a very close friend. The grid and the lining is very important. I had a lot of fun working with Glenna Alvia. I'm so glad I'm part of this project.

I liked working with the artist when we were working with her.

Some day I would like to be in a real movie, but I felt like I could have done more. No one thought I could because I wear glasses. And I never really did anything but I enjoyed having Miss Tarnage come to our school.

I had a lot of fun with the drama teacher. We put on a play that was really fun and she taught us a lot of new stuff. Now next time we have a drama we will know everything there is to know. See you next year.

I liked working with her because it was fun and the movie was funny. That was one of the best things to participate in. And I liked it when Instine fell over the skate board.

I enjoyed making the movie and I liked being in the movie.

Thank you for coming to Ambler School and the best I enjoyed was the movie she had us do. I really enjoyed that and I enjoyed the bard she put aside for Ambler. Thank you and come back next year.

I'm glad that she helped her students. I just hope that she could keep on teaching other students. Thank you Mrs. Turnage.

I like working with her because she helped me learn my lines in about two days. I really like her and she told us how to have expression and stuff like that.

It was fun being with the artist because she was nice and very patient.

I liked Miss Turnage. She was nice to us and I like the way she taught us step by step to become an artist and how to control stuff like cameras etc. I felt perfect with Miss Turnage.

I really like the drama. It was so fun.

The artist was the best because she made us feel better or me do my work.

I like the artist because if you didn't have a job you can make money off of the drawing.

What I like most was being in front of the camera and learning different things.

She was a nice person who tried very hard to do what was right. She did a very good job.

I really enjoyed being withh the artist. It was fun. It turned out to be nice. Although I really was not in the video I had fun anyway. I wish her good luck.

The thing I like most about working with the artist were the film and writing the Sarah stories. The part I didn't like was filming. Since I wasn't in the movie it was boring.

School: Amber Magnet

Artist: Cyndy Turnage
Grade: 6

The artist helped me understand about making movies and film making.

I liked taping the best, and now that I know how my dad lets me use his video camera.

I think she should have been here more.

Cindy Turnage has been very patient with us, considering the class I'm in. It was fun acting in front of a camera, like on t.v. I liked her and the way she enhanced our scenes.

I think they should make it longer.

I like working with my artist. She was very active in our work. I like that in Cindy Turnage. Send her back to Ambler next year even though I will not be here.

She was a great artist and I believe that she should come every year.

She was very good. I think we should have more time with them because we had to cut parts.

I think that the teachers could come twice a week instead of once a week.

I didn't like her as a drama teacher. I didn't like the video she did.

I didn't like not having enough time to film. I liked the movie we made.

I didn't get to do anything. In the activity we did I didn't get a chance to participate. Room 15. We need more time!

Well, Mrs. Turnage could use some help. You know, like another person helping her. So it will not take as long to do things and not so much stress on Mrs. Turnage. But it was very nice.

Cyndi Turnage you were good and you made me proud of myself.

Cyndy was very nice and I liked everything she taught us. She has time to listen to the questions being asked. I would like her again next year.

I learned a lot. I wish we could have had a longer session with the artist.

I think we should have had more time.

I really liked Ms. Turnage and would like to have drama next year.

Mrs. Turnage I think you are a good artist.

I really liked taping and I really wanted to do more taping, but we didn't have time to do much. Anyway, you tried to get through the tape but didn't try hard enough. I hope to continue drama. Thanks!

I felt it was kind of boring. Writing all the junk that we shouldn't have written. I also think it should have been longer. The lady didn't tell us what she should have.

I think it should have been longer.

I like to color so my favorite thing was coloring the beard on my mask.

I liked printing my name and coloring. We drew large letters and then colored them with crayons. I liked doing my mask with yarn hair.

I liked doing the mask best of all. Then I liked doing the T-shirt with fabric crayons.

I liked doing the mask because we used paint crayons and yarn. We put them up in our room.

My favorite project was the masks because I like to draw. I also liked designing my T-shirt.

I liked making the masks especially because it was fun putting on the hair. I also liked the potato prints.

Dear Ms. Livingston and others: I have learned about you and I have taught my friends what you have taught me. And they have liked it very much and I liked it to thank you for all the work you have done for us.

Dear all of you guys: I Russel Tuckerson had lots of fun with you guys. It has been a pleasure meeting you and I've had as lot of fun. Now I have to go now. Your friend, Russel T.

I had learned lots of things. I thought you guys would stay for a long time but I thought wrong. So I just wanted to say Thank You. You've done a lot of things to help me. Your friend, Dawn.

I liked working with you. You made me happy. I liked when skipped backwards, spoting, and turning in the air. I learned how to face, focus, sot, decand, acand. I felt happy of me.

Hi I am Shanee. I just wanted to say that all of you worked real hard and that you made me feel good about myself and I want to thank you for that.

I like my Mother working for me.

I loved working with the four teachers that taught us a lot. I really liked working with them. I liked the moves they taught and the songs they played. I liked Mr. Mizerany a lot because he is funny and tall. I wish they come back again and teach more.

I like Ms. Demarco because she taught me how to backship. I like Ms. Livingston because she thought me how to understand. I like Mr. Mizerany because we have fun. I like Ms. Solin because she was my friend. Thank you for that wonderful time.

I felt like I could do stuff that I couldn't do before. I like the classes but the stuff I liked was the moving. I think if you get another class in this school I bet they will like the classes too. I hope you come back again and get the same class.

Thank you for working with my class and me. We really enjoyed the things we did with you. We thought it was fun. We hope you take care.

Thank you for the thing you taught us and shold us new word we really appreciate all that you did for us

It was fun and come again.

It was nice about all the things.

I felt great but you guys had to leave. I wish you guys would come back.

I liked what I did with the artist and I hope we could do it again some other time.

I like working with the artist because they teach us things and they believe in you. We also learned new things and words, and I feel proud of myself, and I just wished they didn't have to leave.

I try very hard working with you people. I learned a lot of exercised it really helps you. I felt proud of working with you I had a great time.

I like how we did jumps and hop skip and I like all the people who helped me.

I think the dance class is great one thing. I liked it where got in the corner me and Barry jumped real high. Well good bye for now.

I felt good about myself when I work with them they are nice. They help us get along eith each other. I felt wonderful about myself. I learned a lot what I mostly liked was everything because they did it step by step so that we make sure what we are doing. I love them alot.

I have learned a lot from you. Thank you very much. I loved working with you.

It was fun work with all of you. I hope I could see you next year. I learned a lot of things with all of you.

I like when you taught us to spot, leap, twirl, skip, jump, and hop lot of that stuff we didn't know. You made me feel like I can do anything. I hope you guys can come back and teach us how to dance like you guys.

I liked you a lot and I hope we could see you aging. I wish you could see you again. I wish you could come again. I am going to miss you!

The thing I liked most about the workshop was after that I felt good. I felt like getting up and start to run. I learned how to dance, jump, and do everything better. It taught me everything I need to know. I wish they can still teach me more.

I enjoyed jumping in the air and connecting hands. You need more improving on having Mrs. Levingston. I feel good when I work with you.

I enjoyed when they taught me new things.

I wish we have a play.

I think that the dancer taught us more.

What I really liked most about working with the artist is that they taught me I can do anything I want if I try. I learned I can do the locomotive patterns even if there's a turn in it or two. I felt there's hope in me yet, because I felt they believed in me.

In dance class I learned that ascending is going up and descending is going down. I felt good and and proud of doing all of that and that is it.

I like the most about working working with the artist is when they teach us different things. I learned that a hop and a leap are not locomotive. I felt good about it.

I learned a lot of the artist. It was fun. I felt happy when I was working with the artist. I think it was a good idea to have an artist to help us.

I liked running and jumping and I really learned a lot. Thank you. I really felt good in that class.

I liked the last one we did because I liked to jump. I learned a lot. I felt good about myself. I hope you come next year!

I that it was fun.

I like working with the artist because I did things that I was never able to do. I hope we can see them next year. So I could learn more things about dancing.

I realy enjoyed learning from you. It was a lot of fun. I learned a lot of stuff from you. I'd like to participate with you again next year.

I really like this program. I really like how you guys teach us some moves. I wish you guys could of stay for the rest of the year. Everybody felt sad when you guys were going to leave. I really learned a lot from some proffesinal dancers like you. Thank you alot.

I like working with the artist because now I feel better about dancing.

What I liked most about working with the artist is that it was fun to all of the stuff that I learned. Every time I went there I always felt excited because I wanted to know what we had to do every day. I don't think anything can improve it.

What I liked most about working with the artist is that knew what do. I learned about many things I didn't know about. I felt very happy.

I will say that I learned about sidegallop and skipping backwards. I enjoyed when we really danced. I really liked your class. Also I learned about locermation movement.

I felt good. The things I like the most jump as high as we could. You should get more tall women and men. I learned that a leap is one foot to two feet.

The thing I liked most was the last day because we did many fun activities. I learned new words and composers. I felt very good at dance. I don't think anyone could improve it.

I liked making rutins. I learned many different moves. I felt I was happy in the class.

I enjoyed everything a lot. I learn something like localmotive. I felt very happy. I don't think nothing needs to be improved. I had a wonderful time.

I enjoyed working with Ms. Livingston, Ms. Soglin and Ms. DeMarco, but Ms. Livingston wasn't here long. They are very good dancers. I want them back. I wish I had them next year. This year is my second year of dance movement. They taught us a lot of movements.

I really enjoyed working with them and I felt real good working with them. I learned a lot from them how to jump. And I hope they will be here next year.

They can improve by talking louder. They were excellent teachers and they very relaxing music.

I enjoy working with them. They thought us to keep our balance for a long time and they showed us a lot of good things. So our class will like them back again next year because they were wonderful artists. We want the same group again.

I enjoyed working with the artists. They were very nice people. I want to have them next year in G grade.

I felt good working with the artist and no I don't have any ideas for improving because they are very good teachers and they're fun to work with.

I really like working with all of you. But I'm sorry I didn't yet give you your picture of my snoopy and Charlie Brown.

My comment is Ms. Livingston was gone for awhile. The thing I liked most was at the beginning when we go in groups to our seats in line doing an activity. I learned how to leap. I felt good about myself.

I wish we had more time with them. I miss them because they teach us real good.

I really liked the dance classes. The thing that I like most is they are soported.

I enjoyed working with the artist.

I really like working with Ms. Livingston.

The artist was very nice. I have one bad comment. Mrs. Livingston was not here very long. I like the part when they showed us different movements.

I liked working with Mrs. Livingston because I learned a lot of stuff. I learned how to skip.

I licked all of the programs that the dance class showed. It was kind of difficult.

I wish we spent more time with you. We learned facing and focus and sitting down by turning.

The thing I liked the most about dance class is our teachers. I learned different things like leaps, jumps, and skips. When they taught me those things I felt confident. The workshops were good but at the end they could have the kids put on a show.

I like dancing across the floor because is fun and I always do it when run and I enjoyed working with my artist.

I like being with them. It was fun and I felt good working with the artist. I learned a lot from them. I learned new movement.

I liked that they taught me good. They showed me new things. They were the best artist teachers.

I thought the workshop was fun. It gave me something to do after hard work. I did things with the artists that I never thought of. I liked to work in groups also. I'm glad I had the chance to work with the artist.

I had a lot of fun while they were here and I enjoyed dancing. If we could do it again I would choose the same artist because they were nice and I knew them better.

I learned a lot with them, I wish we were still having dancing lessons. I like everything they teached us.

I really enjoyed the dance class and I look forward to doing it again.

I really liked working with Mrs. Oklan and Mr. Mizerany! They really helped us a lot. I learned how to stretch out and how to jump and turn, also how to relax and concentrate. I really appreciate them for teaching us arts.

I think they should give a little bit of individual attention. All they did was give the assignment and sit down. Except when the lady with the camera (video) was there. Then they acted very nice. They didn't usually act like that.

I liked how they showed us to do the trick. I also liked the way she made us have partners; if it weren't for rhem I would not have my best friends. I also liked the music she played.

I had lots of fun in the dance class. I learned a lot of things. Like learning how to work with others. I hope one of these days they come and perform for our school.

I really liked working with the artist. They were very nice and kind and boy can they dance good.

I felt great dancing and I just want to thank you all a whole lot and I've never felt as good as I did and I hope that I get to see them again and if I pass the sixth grade I'll come and visit you!

I had a lot of fun working on dance with everyone in dance class. There is a lot of things in dance. I'm going to miss especially out teachers. I would like to have dance until the school year's over but we have culmination. I thank you for the time you spent on our class and also for teaching us so much.

I liked working with the artists because it was fun and enjoyable. The artists taught us a lot about how to keep good balance and how to work with our friends. I don't really have any ideas for the future, but I can tell you one thing: it was fun!

One of my things are I got to know people. Me and other friends had a lot of fun. The teachers we had are nice people. I enjoyed dance class a lot. I learned a lot of new words and definitions of words. Our drama teachers had a lot of patience.

Hi it's me Shawn. I really loved what you've done for our class and other classes. I really had fun and really learned a lot from all of you. Thank you and I hope we see you next year.

When I went to the first dance class I was nervous. But I enjoyed it a lot. I learned how to jump looking at my spot and I really liked how you made us work with partners because have gotten closer to each student. I want to thank you with all your support and help. P.S. I wish we could spend more time together.

I really liked the dance class. It was really fun. Now I know the difference between a hop, skip, leap and a jump. I wish we could have had longer weeks with Loretta Livingston and her helpers. It was really fun having them at our school. We miss them a lot.

I think it was a great experience to work with an artist and do their activities with them. We had some fun times with them . I think the whole class did. Thank you for sharing your time with us.

I liked working with Ms. Livingston. When I first went in there I did not know many of the steps, some others didn't either. As soon as she saw us she tried to help us. Now I got it all set. When I was there I felt good after knowing that I could do it. I also liked the music they played. It was very interesting.

The thing I liked about working with the artist is dance. The steps we have to take rotating around with partners it was really fun they made us laugh and happy we hope we can see them anywhere anytime.

I learned a little from the artist. Like how to do some dance steps.

I like working with the artist because I enjoy doing the things we did. It was very funny especially when we did the different shapes and jumping and stuff like that. But I especially like when we worked together.

I felt good about taking the class Dance. I hope we have again next year because I like it a lot because it teaches me a good lesson to learn how to dance and I can teach my brother all the things that I learned in dance class and we enjoy your lessons.

I really liked the artist. They teach real well. It helped me from getting better of dancing. I'm in a dance club and I learned even better steps from what I all ready new. I wish I could see them again and thank you.

I think this experience was great! I especially liked when we had to jump around. I liked working with the other artists. I'll miss them all. I really don't think you need to change anything, it's already great! Good luck in the future and thank you!

I liked working with the artist because it was fun and exciting. And they encouraged usthat we can do it and we did a lot of fun things, like moving in a local motor movement and working with others. I wish I can be in that class next year when I go to junior high.

I learned what the difference is between a leap and a jump. I thought that it was fun. I think that feild trip would be better.

I thought it was really nice. I learned how to make a pattern and really nice shaps. I learned how to work with a partner and like working with them.

I liked the teachers, the music and all the jumping around. That made me excited and happy.

I liked the way they explained everything. I also like the music they played. And I enjoyed having them.

I liked the music, the jumping and the exserys.

I felt happy, and I learned how to do some things I thought I didn't know how to do them.

I like dance because it gave me more strength.

I wish we still had dance class all year round. We could like sign up for after school sessions.

I enjoyed the music and the support they gave me. I liked how our teachers complimented us. My teacher enjoyed it too.

I would like to learn more of dance class and I did enjoy it a lot.

I liked the teachers who worked with us in the class and some stuff they did.

I liked all the teachers. They were great. They made know that I put my mind to everything I want. Now I know how to jump, leap, and side gallop etc. I would like to see you again. Thanks for all you did for me. Thank you very much.

I learned how to skip, good how to skip backward.

I liked all the teachers because they taught me that I don't have to say that I can't do anything because I can. I enjoyed them really much. They are really nice to have around. I want to say thank you to Mrs. Sogler, Mr. Mizeranie, Mrs. Livingston, and the other girl-I can't remember her name. The teachers were excellent.

I did not like it when Mrs. Livingston left. The other teachers were boring! But I did enjoy it when Mrs. Livingston was there. She is fun to work with.

I enjoyed the dance program because I learned to many things that I could ever do.

I enjoyed dancing with the dancers. And I hope they could come again.

I liked it because I was able to express myself. I hardly do because of what other people might say. I would like to do it again but I might go to seventh grade. And I liked the music they put on like Paula Abdul and Bobby Brown.

I liked the music and the two teachers that teach us. I would like you to make different dances. Thanks a lot! Friends.

I liked doing big leaps and side gallops because its fun. But I liked some of the music you put the ones from long time ago and the ones fom today like Bobby Brown and Paula Abdul.

I liked the way Mrs. Soglin taught us the leap and to do stationary movement and also to skip backwards.

I liked the head spot and I hated the stretches.

I felt happy and learned a lot from you guys. I like the music they put on sometimes.

I really liked to dance with you. I had you for two years and I learned more and more but I still think I can do better if I tried. I liked when we did stuff with partners and thought the teachers were real nice.

I really liked the artists and I also apresheat for them giving up their time to teach us what they know and I really enjoyed their music.

I did feel very good to be with Ms. Wilson because she's very nice, but we needed more time to work (S.T.).

I did feel good and it was pretty. It was very nice they helped us to see things when they are good or bad. And they also helped us too when we can't see things like the eyes, the nose, the mouth, the ears and the hair (S.T.).

I did like it when we made the mask and paint pages with colors. I would like for them to do a better competition (S.T.).

I did feel very happy when I got into the art classroom. I did learn a little of art. Now we are doing a mask (S.T.).

I did like one mask that we did with the teacher. I like everything that she taught us. The sculpture. I thank Ms. Wilson for teaching us many things. I did like everything (S.T.).

What I liked the most was how Ms. Wilson explained how to do art, how to learn. The thing that I liked the most that I did with Ms. Wilson was the mask that we're doing. I did feel happy because I felt I was the famous artist of art (S.T.)

What I liked the most was the mask. And what I learned was how to do the mask of clay. And when we do all of those cups we paint them outside and they look like they were old (S.T.).

What I liked the most about the class was when we made the mask and when we painted them. What they can do to teach us better is to put more paintings in other classes in the program (S.T.)

What I liked the most with Ms. Williams were the conversations of the sculpture. I did like what we did with Ms. Wilson, how to draw a statue. I did feel very happy to be with Ms. Wilson because it's a good program (S.T.).

I did like the art because it was pretty. Also I didn't know anything about it. They teach us art, also they say a few jokes and our teacher Ms. Wilson was very nice (S.T.).

Ms. Wilson I think your class is nice. I did like the sculpture because it was pretty. It was something I always wanted to learn. Thank you for telling me not to use cameras with flash in the museum. I think when I grow up I would like to be an artist if not a model (S.T.).

I did like working with the artist with the mask, and I did learn the colors, rectangles, and the colors. She taught me how to do the mask and if we had more time I would like...(S.T.).

I like the artist. Please give us more time. We did paintings and masks. We learned shapes, tones, color, and about art. I enjoyed the things we did. And we need more time.

Ms. Wilson was very nice and I like when we did the mask out of the clay. When we painted them that was a lot of fun. I learned about realism, cubism, and a lot of famous artists.

I like working with the artist because I learned many things. I learned how to do a mask. I felt very proud of myself when I had finished the mask.

I really enjoyed working with the artist because she taught us very interesting things I never learned before in my life. I hope we could have her again because I enjoy doing art with her because she helps us a lot. And I love Ms. Elaine Wilson.

I think that the art teacher was nice and if when I am here at Suva if she is an artist teacher here I will join.

I like most of the artist because she explained well. That's why I like the art teacher. I felt proud because I was knowing a lot of stuff with her.

I was very proud that you didn't give us extra day to do other things but there was something good. I really enjoyed the mask. P.S. I hope you teach tenth grade.

I really enjoyed working with the artist. She taught me lots of really nice things. I want to be an artist and a vetrenarian. Those are really nice things I want to be when I grow up. So I will learn a lot of things.

I liked it very much and I will begin work with the mask that we done. I don't think you have to do anything more.

I really enjoy being a student of Ms. Wilson because she helps you. She does not put you down. I felt very special when she said my job was beautiful and I hope we could have her again because she is very nice and pretty.

I like making the cary fars and I when we draw the picture of the cat. That's what I like the best.

What I liked working with the artist on the masks because they were real cool. I felt very happy when she told us that we were going to do masks. She was very nice to us.

What I liked most about the art class was how I learned things I never knew about art. I also enjoyed doing masks out of clay. I learned a lot of this and I'll try to use it in the future. I felt happy working with her. She taught me a lot. I would like her to make us do more painting, etc.

I learned that you could do any kind of work in your art or mask or any kind of shape. My experience with the artist that I like the way she made us feel like we could do anything. I like mostthe things she said to make what ever kind of line only six or curly.

I liked the mask we did because I've learned that when we all die, it would be wonderful some other generation check out what we had almost looked like. I felt very proud of myself. Yes on how wonderful sculpture, painting are. It could be very fun.

I felt that I can do staff gooder. When I was Ms. Wilson I can do better stuff when I was with Ms. Wilson.

What I really liked about you was that you explained everything just great and you helped us. If we had questions you would answer them, and most of all you weren't boring like other teachers. I think that you are the best art teacher that any student could actually have.

I love to work with the artist and when I grow up I want to be just like he is and win lots of money and help people to learn lot of the art. Thank you for all your help and I hope to see you next year.

When I was in her class I was so excited because I wanted to do art. And for learn more things about Miss Wilson that she was a very artsist.

Making sculptures and painting them. I learned if you keep trying you can do anything. I felt proud for what a good job I did. I think its fine how they are.

I felt happy because I learned about a lot of art. She taught us how to work with clay and brush paint what douse in artest youses on the art paper. I like working with the art teacher. Thank you.

I like working with Mrs. Elaine Wilson because she's fun. What I liked the most was when we made drawings of coffee cups. She really changed my life. I've been getting better grades now.

When I bearly started working with the artist I felt I could do art a lot. I learned that I could do sculptures, and I felt happy working with art.

I liked making our mask and going to the museum, and everything else I felt good working with the artist. I learned that I can make mostly anything.

I liked working with Mrs. Wilson. When we were making mask with clay, my mask broke and Mrs. Wilson told me how to fix it. My mask came out great. I painted it and I put a mouth on it and nose. I painted it a good color. I like the color I put on it. And we mixed the paints and a good color came out of it.

When Ms. Wilson gave us classes I felt I will want to be an artist. If I became an artist I will make sculptures and sell it. My best part is when Ms. Wilson sent us to make masks.

I experieced how the colors, shapes and lines bring out your feelings. I liked the clay art the most. I learned more about the artist and what kind of art they do. I felt good and proud of myself. Thank you Ms. Wilson.

I like when we did the mask because I felt like I was the artist. I learned that being an artist is fun. And it isn't hard if you try hard it is fun. Being an artist I like it even though it ain't one.

I like the most things of art is when we made things with plays do and when we do drawings shapes and I learned a lot of things.

I enjoy working with her. She taught us a lot. I especially like the activities. I like the masks we're making.

I liked it because I needed to learn more about art because I didn't know anything about it.

The best part about art is that we painted and I worked on masks. I felt proud of myself because I learned to do many things with Ms. Wilson.

I like masks that we did because it was done by Ms. Wilson. She is an intelligent woman. She does things like painting and sculpture. She teaches very fast. Thank you Mrs. Wilson.

I like the mask that we did because it was done by Mrs. Wilson. She is the most best teacher of art. She is intelligent. She does mask and sculpture. She has the most greatist painting. Thank you Mrs. Wilson.

Yes I really enjoyed working with her. But I really liked working with the clay. But I really think that we should have more time because we need it.

I felt nice about it because I was going to learn more but I would like more time because when we are going to start on it its already time to go so I wish we could have more time.

Give us more time. I learned about shapes, colors, sculpture.

I felt proud of me because she teach me a lot of art work and words like sculptures and abstractions. It was very nice working with the art teacher. We need more time. Thank you.

Give us more time. I have much fun working with you because you're so nice.

I learned very much in the art teachers. She was very helpful with us. When I made the sculpture I didn't know how much experience I had in art. Please we need more time.

We need more time because we need more time to work.

I felt like if I were an artist because she talked about a lot of artist and shapes. We have a lot of fun wirh her because we paint we do drawing. But there is one problem: we need more time.

Yes I liked the teacher because she made us feel really good about ourselves. She was the best artist I met. I just wish you would give us more time to do the paintings and sculptures with her. I enjoyed going to art classes.

Yes since I went with the artist I have more experience in more stuff and masks and sculptures. We need more time to work on our projects.

Give us more time to do the art. I feel supras about the work a dan a fell that she is a great artist. I felt that the sculpture was great.

Give us more time. I felt excited about the whole thing. I learned what was a sculpture is 3D and a point is 2D. She made me feel like I could do it.

Give us more time to learn about the artist and shapes, sculpture.

Give us more time to finish the activity. I had a good time during the activity.

I liked working with the artist because you get very inspired. But the time went by very fast and we would not finish our art work. I really strongly suggest that you give us more time. It was also a very cheerful experience. I learned a lot more about art.

I liked how the art teachers showed me how to do the masks because I learned a lot from her. I learned to do noses for the masks I done and I also learned about different artists.

What I like most about working with the artist was that she explained everything excellent, I learned a lot from her especially about painting. I felt good because if we needed help she would have come and helped us. No, I don't have any ideas improving the workshop. They're good.

I Know that painting have lines, shape, and color. I also learned about cubisome. I learned the kind of paintings some artist do. I feel like if I know more than other grownups. Ms. Wilson is my best art teacher.

I liked going to the museum and making the masks the best. I learned how to tell who the painting was done by from the style. I felt like I was an artist. I would have improved it by giving more time to work.

I really liked to do the masks with the artist. I learned about artists that were very famous a lot of years ago. I felt very good about doing art work with the artist. I have one for improving the workshops, my idea is for we can do more artwork.

What I liked about Ms. Wilson is that she let us do things that we can't do in class. I learned many things by the lesson she gave us. What I liked most was when we were doing the masks. You really get into them.

I learned to do art more better with shapes and drawing things. I like to do are masks and making them look good and painting them. That's what I like most in her class. She helped us learn about 3d and 2d and real paintings from the fake paintings. I liked the stuff from the museum and we knew a lot cause Ms. Wilson taught us.

I liked the masks the most because they were new to me. I learned many names of artists and their act, after working with her. My feeling were good because I really love art. I enjoyed the museum very much.

I liked it because I learned a lot from her. I felt good being in her classroom. I learned a lot of stuff from her. It was fun because she had a lot of pictures and I liked the museum too. There were a lot of nice paintings.

I liked the most when we did the sculptures. I learned a lot about Pablo Picasso and Diego Rivera. I felt happy. I don't know.

What I liked about the artist is that she's funny and goes real slow and not fast that don't do anything write. I really liked her! I learned more than ever about 2D and 3D and Representational art and abstraction. I felt like I knew more than anyone in my family that knew art. I know about making masks and how you paint them. My only comment is that she is one great artist!!!!

I really liked the pictures that the artist showed us. It feels like you know everything about art. I liked the museums a lot. Especially Diego Rivera and Pablo Picasso.

I liked working with the artist. We learn about cubism, 3D and 2D, representation, realism, surrealism, other artists, and more. I felt good about working with the artist. I was also happy when we went to the L.A. county museum. There were many art work that were beautiful. I would like to improve on all the art work I did with the artist.

I liked working with the clay and making masks. I learned a lot of things. I felt frustrated. No I don't because I'm not a very good art teacher.

I really enjoyed working with the artist. I feel like I am more into the art. I liked going to the museum and making the masks best of all. I learned a lot, and I had fun.

What I like about the art teacher is that she taught me about representational art and abstraction art.

What I liked most with the artist was the clay because I had lots of fun. I learned about shape, line and color. I felt good because I didn't know I had talent on art and the artist taught me a lot and when we worked together on clay, she said it was terrific and nobody ever said that to me.

I liked sculpturing the mask and working with the artist the most. The artist was fun to work with. Oh I almost forgot I loved the museum.

I liked using the clay. It was pretty interesting. I felt proud of myself for trying my best. I loved painting it. I learned a lot. Next time I will do a better job! Ms. Wilson is great! I learned that a sculpture is 3D and a painting is 2D

I liked the museums and I liked making the masks. I learned about Pablo Picasso and Mary Casset. I felt good to know a lot about paintings of artists.

I had a good time working with the artist. I like Ms. Wilson because she was patient and kind. I learned how art is not just a piece of paint but is a real good ability that people have. I felt good working with Ms. Wilson. No ideas. Just that Ms. Wilson is the "BEST"!

I liked most of when we did our masks. I learned about different kinds of art. I felt very good when I found lots of ideas for improving the work that we did with the teacher. At the museum I found mostly Pablo Picasso's paintings. I found one Digo Rivera and Mary Casset.

I felt much better. I learned lots of things. She is a great teacher to show us art. The thing that I like most is the L.A. county museum and the mask that we did. The improve of my workshop I work hard.

I liked the clay. I loved making the mask. I've learned about paintings. I felt happy when I went with her. We could have some more time

I like her and she's nice and we do fun things with her. We learned a lot of stuff from her and she dresses nice. We do a lot of stuff with her and sometimes I like to draw. At the museum there are a lot of nice things. What I learned at the museum is not to touch nothing at the museum at all. We had lots of fun at the museum.

I liked painting and drawing my fish on the wall.

I like the mask that we did.

What I liked most about the art were the masks. Also what I did like to do in art was painting, drawing things. All of that was what I liked most about art. (S.T.)

What I liked the most was the mask and talking to Ms. Wilson. And I did like the cup that we did. I liked everything that was taught to us and I thank her for teaching me. (S.T.)

I was amazed by sculptures how old they were, and amazed that some painting look so real, we need more time to work on our projects.

I felt very proud of myself because she made me feel that I could really try to do something without even trying it. We need more time.

I liked working on the mural project because of the artist that worked with my school. Her name is Glenna Avila. The mural project was fun because Glenna helped me with the work on it.

The things I liked about working with the artist is that she took more time with us and explained everything to us.

I liked the artist very much and I would like her to stay more time with us. Because she tiched me things that I didn't know.

She was always explaining things to us and she help us a lot and went we ask her a question she said diteles. We need more time.

I enjoyed bare much becas she help us bare much and wend we make mestak she dosent get mad and I lik her cas she is bere nase and becas we enjoy alot that clas. We wan more time.

I lake it because could make alot of stuff. And because a lorn about my favorite thing is art. I wish I could have it again. I wish I could be a artist. I make paints, to do mask I really enjoy.

I enjoid doing art work and bringing things in too to put on the art work and I think I am learning more than I yustu now.

I like the artist because she explained us how to do this and that. I learned a lot from her. And I felt happy. I felt intelligent and I liked when we did the masks because I learned a lot. And I loved working with her. I wish I was an artist because she explained very good everything.

I liked most of doing with the artist is the sculpture cause it was fun. What I learned is that you need to try your best and concentrate. I felt very happy working with her. Well I wanna thank her for teaching us a lot.

The things I liked the most about working with the artist is that she taught me lots of things and even gave us a tip for the class.

What I like about the artist is very teacher. I like the way she works with children and helps the children and she likes when she does it.

When I was working in the working class I have fun and learn more things about art and painting too. When I was in the art class I felt like Miss Wilson was a good artist and that was all about what side of art was it or we will get to do things like paint and make sculptures with her too. It was so fun with her in art class. And I hope to see her again.

I didn't get much of a chance to paint but I did put on a little. It was fun working on the fishes and choosing. At the end I thought it was a waste of time.

I like to work with Glenna because she was a very good teacher and you could understand her and I don't have any ideas for improving the workshops, because I think that Glenna is doing a wonderful job.

I think it was really fun working with Glenna. I learned how to draw pretty good. You can improve by making the kids draw real fish and paint them the way they really are.

What I really liked most about Glenna is that she was nice and if you made a mistake she would understand. She says "there are no mistakes in art". She really cares.

The Mural was a very nice experience for me. I didn't think the mural was going to turn out right but it did. It was beautiful.

I did not like the way the artist in residence taught because she was too unfair in giving the parts out and the space for our fish to go down. I did not like the artist and think she should be fired.

It was sloppy, messy, great and funny.

I didn't like it because she colored the border pink. I didn't like the way people drawed. Some pictures were ugly but got chosen. Those are some of the things I hate.

My experience with Glenna was absolutely fabulous. The reason I liked doing it.

I enjoyed working with Glenna because she is a fun person to do work with. I also liked the mural because it looks bright and colorful and also it makes our school happy and proud.

I have really enjoyed working with Glenna. But some of the decisions she made I did not like. But as the mural appears I love it.

I had a lot of fun working with the artist and I...

Thank you Glenna for all you have done because you taught me that there's no mistake in art and we almost got done I thought it would look great and it did. Thanks Glenna. Thank you!

Glenna was nice but she wasn't putting forth enough effort to help us.

The mural was really nice in the end. I wish that we could of done bigger fish. Like a big whale. I thank Music Center for giving us this experience! Thank you!

Comments: Teacher Survey

Comments:

Children thoroughly enjoyed the sessions andbenefitted greatly. I learned a lot and was able to transform some of this into my classroom.

I wasn't really aware of the direction of a lesson- If I had had a total course outline to begin, things would have made more sense. We never had much chance to talk with Peter.

I loved the workshops. I thought they were especially great for getting the E.S.L. and shy kids to participate. Thanks Peter!

I appreciate the positive effect on a number of my students' self esteem. Uncooperative students began to participate and "enjoy" themselves.

Gerald Mc Call is outstanding. A true pleasure to work with!

Enjoyed tremendously! Students were enthusiastic and looked forward to each session. Hope to participate again next year.

Excellent program! Well planned and received by students. An outstanding opportunity for everyone involved! Outstanding teachers established great rapport with students!

This is an outstanding program. I have had two very difficult sixth grade classes, heavy on boys, which have been very successful in the program despite discipline problems. My first class, now seventh graders, return often and still speak of the residency with positive comments.

Aside from a few end-of-the-program changes in schedule which were affected by miscommunication, everything was great! I'd love to have my class participate in this program next year.

I really enjoyed artists-in-residence and know that the children also really enjoyed it. I don't know how fair my evaluation is since I only observed 3 sessions and therefore can not really see how it has changed or influenced the children. I feel that this program is wonderful for children.

Great program!!

I thought this was an excellent program; definitely one that children benefitted from. It was nice to have an "expert" work with the children rather than the individual teachers.

My students and I would have benefitted from this residency if I had a scheduled ahead of time types of stories, activities planned. Then I could have planned more effective follow-up.

I have enjoyed working with Mr. McCall very much!

My rating of the students' willingness to express themselves and work with the others well and cooperativeness is not negative. It's just that these were skills which were built prior to the A in R program. The program did help to maintain these skills though. Thanks.

Make sure enough time is set aside to complete the project. I am not satisfied with the finished product (comm. Magnet School).

What a great program- hope our year round status doesn't penalize us.

As I reflect on the above program list, I realize that I would have loved to have 10-15 minutes built into the program that would allow teacher and artist to discuss ongoing activities writing assignments etc. (this on a weekly basis).

I waited for Auben to pull it all together and weran out of time so I pulled it all together and felt inadequate doing so in the light of his expertise.

Glenna was always very positive and pleasant to work with and the children really liked working with her, and looked forward to her coming to our school.

My students really enjoyed the Artist-in-Residence Program and gained a lot from it.

Excellent program. I learned a lot from resident artist. Time seems to be a constraint. I really saw a difference in the attitude and willingness of children to dance at our end of the year dance. The ones that had the residency did much better!

Excellent program! Thank you for allowing me to participate in such a unique program. I have been tremendously enriched in art appreciation and production and so have my students. My only regret: class periods were a bit short. (60 min. not enough) We felt rushed at times, but a sincere thank-you!

The artist (Elaine Wilson) is wonderful-a great teacher to the kids-a very nice person to work with.

The program was fantastic!

No real serious problems. The children really enjoyed the sessions.

This program was an eye opener to me since I have class of LEP children and wondered what good Shakespeare would be? It was very good particularly in getting the children to open up orally. Specifically it gave Carlos a chance to be a star and he opened up tremendously. He could tell you all about _A Midsummer Night's Dream_. I also was able to generate a good writing project. The only limit on this type of program is the imagination of the teacher. The kids take to it naturally.

My students loved Barry Glass. He offered support and a true appreciation of the children's creative abilities. He was able to flow with what was going on at school that day.

Comments specific to item #49 ("other" problems)

Outside distractions: recess/assemblies, people coming into classroom/auditorium while students were performing.

I would have liked at least half an hour in my classroombefore workshops--It was first thing on Monday morning. Bad day for the program-Minimum day! Need a bit more clarity on what is expected of the teacher. We had to go home right away.

I feel the set-up of the over all program was balanced to fit the needs of all.

We thought Ruben was going to provide a video tape of our show, but we never did receive it.

None of these were a serious problem. Very late in the school year and everything was rather compressed.

Comments: Artist Survey

Comments:

Poor communication and order at this school. Classes often cancelled, interrupted, or something with no notice to me and teachers as well.

Attitudes of the school personnel (cafeteria workers, janitors, staff, etc.) which were either hostile or indifferent and not helpful.

Other: lack of stereo, video and such to help teaching.

Great school!! Extremely rewarding residency. Howard Yogel and the teachers were fantastic.

This was an experienced school with a good deal of cooperation from staff and students.

Very good Residency! The third year at this school is really showing a growth with the staff and teachers concerning our program. Length or number of workshop days was minimal...more days needed.

Problems? What problems? This was a wonderful Residency-Teachers and school staff and principle and kids were all a joy to work with!

There really weren't any problems in this residency—except that one teacher missed most of the workshops, due to jury duty, etc.!

Class dispersal of one class for several weeks put a bit of strain on all the classes. If a class is combined (1st and 2nd grade) all the students should be able to work. Otherwise-the teachers and students of 99th street school are the best!

Scheduling of drama rehearsals conveniently left artist out. Only final week were all brought together. By then, some of the problems the 'Director' had were beyond fixing, as there was too little time for fine tuning all points.

Item #53 ("Other" Problems)

Commuter traffic often had me tired by the last class. Perhaps classes could rotate times. Otherwise, students can suffer from being in the end of the day slot (or some such time).

Commuter traffic

Commuter traffic (land a half hours each way) at peak hours and freeway construction exhausted me before even the first class.

Unforseen problem with auditorium caused some re-sheduling.

Communication between schools and music center.

classes should be scheduled for the second part of the year so that they're more socially skilled.

Teachers didn't take enough responsibility for following up and maintaining classroom discipline.

My rehearsal space which meant I was bumped out of the auditorium and into the classrooms where there there was no dancing space, so those times (and half the time this happened) I only got to rehearse on music.

Overlapping lunch hours took away some of the students for some of the class workshop time.

Comments: Parent Survey

I recently accompanied my child's class on a field trip, and was surprised at how much they knew about the different artists. They seemed very much interested in all the different types of art work.

All three of my children absolutely love this program.

I think it was a very interesting trip. I enjoyed it very much and I think the children were very interested in art.

In the future I would appreciate notes being sent home about the Artist-in-Residence program and their involvement with my child and the contents of the material that they will be teaching my child.

I believe any chance for the children to be exposed to self expression through the arts is a wonderful learning tool. The dances and the lore behind them was learned through fun and pride on a job well done. It is an excellent tool to join our multicultural children together as one group, yet holding on to the beauty of ethnic differences. A job well done, I do hope to see more of this type of teaching. Thank you for keeping the interest level of my child at least more than just the 3-R's.

All of your programs for school year 89/90 were very successful for all fields in my childs as well as for others in helping them achieve academic goals. I feel dancing had the greatest impact on the children. They all participated and felt self gratification. My child didn't like to write. Dancing has inspired her to write. When Mr. McCall left she was very depressed and looks forward to more dance sessions. Without the arts our children would be in serious trouble. Thank you for sending us such talented artists.

Yes, I think the school should have more programs like this. Thank you.

I'm sure that my daughter enjoyed the program, but I truly believe that it did not make that much difference in her life.

The Arts-in-Residence program could introduce a historical perspective of music e.g. gospel, jazz, relationship between ballet and dances of today—dances of today, rap and poetry—this could make the program more relative and interesting. Also if parents could be more involved either by supplying music, books on poetry, help in class etc., but especially if the parents know what subject is being taught in order that they might support the Arts-in-Residence program. Thank you!

My children are able to listen to pleasanter music and want to go to the museum and talk about how to express themselves in speech, because of the artist. They look forward to going to the program annd she should be here all far.

I hope the school continues to have the artist-in-Residence because my child really enjoyed it.

My daughter likes the Artist-in-Residence Program due to her interests in music, dancing, and also, she learned a lot about writing.

It's a real opportunity and Brenna really enjoys the dance class. Adding a dance program might be fun!

Comments: Administrator Survey

Comments:

Elaine presented an outstanding program in every way.

A great program—Well planned, good follow up. Thanks.

Focus of this residency changed, causing us to need the and for this residency. And was already committed to another residency.

Our residency was excellent. The music center liason was a great addition to our meetingsbut not necessary to our success. However, if we were in an unsuccessful residency, the addition of the music center would have been vital.

Item #47 ("Other" Problems)

Time for teacher and artist to meet, assess and plan during the residency.

Comments: School-Residency Coordinator Survey

This was a wonderful experience for our teachers and students- stimulating, enlightening. Elaine was not only good at teaching content, but was a wonderful model in terms of teaching strategies.

I felt on the whole that this cluster of teachers did not milk this residency for all it was worth. I figure the reasons were due to lowered expectations for students, lack of a personal value for the arts, etc. A syllabus from the artist with specific vocals and written language activities would have been helpful.

Although by the end of the residency, all teachers were enthusiastic, collaboration with several of them was very difficult at first. Differing cultural attitudes, as well as a lack of experience in working this creatively with an artist, caused some teachers to feel uncomfortable. They consequently invested little of themselves in the process. The situation could have been alleviated through 1) better communication from me prior to the experience 2) testimonials, conversations with or videotaped interviews with teachers who had already participated as partners with an artist. The experience is so foreign to many teachers that they resist it at first (these remarks are intended to explain the attitudes and backgrounds of teachers rather than to reflect negatively upon the MCED or its artists). I would like to see school coordinators plan with the MCED for a more visceral orientation for participating teachers some weeks prior to the start of the partnership. N.B. Please provide student questionnaire forms in both Spanish and English next time.

Appendix E

MCED Evaluation Meeting Questions

MCED Evaluation Meeting Questions

Purpose of Meeting: to discuss the residency process and outcomes from perspectives of artists & teachers.

Questions:

- What worked?
- What has carried over into your classroom teaching?
- Any changes in students that you can describe?
- Was the content of the residency sessions stimulating and/or workable for you?
- Suggestions for other content areas to be included.
- What problems did you experience?
- Did you feel comfortable talking with, making decisions with and/or expanding on the artists sessions?
- What have you most naturally integrated into your own teaching/classroom units
- What were the feelings about the culmination event?
- What NEXT STEPS do you envision? (Work with the same artist/discipline and continue the partnership, or select other teachers/same artist, or other artist and discipline?)
- How did the scheduling work for you? Day of the week?
- Facilities: Auditorium or classroom?
- Scheduling in Fall or Winter preferred in relation to ongoing school/classroom activities?
- Anything else?
- Continuity, pacing, teacher follow-up, artist communication?